

822.04 E52
KEEP YOUR CARD IN THIS POCKET

Books will be issued only on presentation of proper library cards.

Unless labeled otherwise, books may be retained for two weeks, subject to renewal for a like period. Borrowers finding book marked, defaced or mutilated are expected to report same at library desk; otherwise the last borrower will be held responsible for all imperfections discovered.

The card holder is responsible for all books drawn on this card.

No books issued unless fines are paid.

Lost cards and change of residence must be reported promptly.



**PUBLIC LIBRARY,
KANSAS CITY, MO.**

KEEP YOUR CARD IN THIS POCKET

BERKOWITZ ENVELOPE COMPANY
KANSAS CITY, MO.

KANSAS CITY, MO. PUBLIC LIBRARY



0 0001 4621833 2

NOTES ON ELIZABETHAN DRAMATISTS

WITH

CONJECTURAL EMENDATIONS OF THE TEXT.

KARL ELZE.

HALLE:

MAX NIEMEYER.

1880.

PREFACE.

PART of the following Notes and Emendations have already appeared in various Periodicals, both German and English, and they have shared the fate incident to all ephemeral publications — they have been little heeded and soon forgotten: I have therefore yielded to the temptation of attempting to preserve in a more permanent shape, these *disiecti membra critici*, and of adding to them fresh matter hitherto unpublished.

It is well known, that conjectural emendations are not unfrequently written on the spur of the moment instead of being as fully matured as other literary productions. At the present day when scholars almost all over the world are busy in translating, explaining, and revising the works of Shakespeare and his contemporaries, critics are naturally apprehensive lest they be anticipated in their emendations and therefore hasten to avail themselves of some one or other of the numerous opportunities offered to them for publication. Sober second thoughts and better wisdom are wont to come after the *fait accompli*, when the critic awakes to the knowledge that Goethe's beautiful line, —

Es irrt der Mensch, so lang er strebt,

is no less true of verbal criticism than of morals. Numerous conjectures, therefore, have to be withdrawn, a penalty which

all verbal critics, more or less, have had to pay, and always will have; for verbal criticism neither can, nor will, be stopped: it is essential to the advancement of learning. The eminent philologist Gottfried Hermann, who stands in the front rank of verbal critics, in one of his lectures, delivered it as his conviction that a verbal critic of the true stamp should be willing like Saturn to devour his own offspring. As one of his disciples, therefore, I cannot be blamed if, following his precept and example, I hereby eat those conjectural emendations of Elizabethan dramatists which I have hitherto published and which are not contained in my editions of Elizabethan plays, in Messrs Warnke's and Pröscholdt's Edition of 'Mucedorus', and in the present collection; at the same time let me breathe the hope that the emendations published in those editions and in this collection may not need, at some future day, to be subjected to the same Saturnian process. My conjectural emendations in the text of 'Mucedorus', which appeared originally in the *Shakespeare-Jahrbuch* XIII, 45 seqq., have been excluded from the present collection merely on the ground that almost all of them — and some fresh ones to boot — have been embodied in the edition of that play by Messrs Warnke and Pröscholdt. The emendations of 'Mucedorus' contained in the present volume have not been published before.

Halle, November 1879.

K. E.

CONTENTS.

<i>Anonymous Plays.</i>	Page
Arden of Feversham, I	1
The Birth of Merlin, II—VI	1
Edward III, VII—XI	4
Fair Em, XII—XXX	6
Histrion-Mastix, XXXI	20
The London Prodigal, XXXII—XXXV	20
Mucedorus, XXXVI—XL	22
No-body and Some-body, XLI	26
The Play of Stucley, XLII	26
<i>Chapman.</i>	
Alphonsus, XLIII	26
<i>Greene.</i>	
Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay, XLIV	27
<i>Marlowe.</i>	
Tamburlaine, XLV—XLVII	28
Edward II, XLVIII—XLIX	30
<i>Shakespeare and Fletcher.</i>	
The Two Noble Kinsmen, L	31
<i>Shakespeare.</i>	
The Tempest, LI—LVI	33
The Two Gentlemen of Verona, LVII	40

	Page
A Midsummer-Night's Dream, LVIII—LXI	41
The Merchant of Venice, LXII—LXVI	44
As You Like It, LXVII	49
The Taming of the Shrew, LXVIII—LXXIII	50
Twelfth Night, LXXIV	55
King John, LXXV—LXXXII	56
Romeo and Juliet, LXXXIII	66
Timon of Athens, LXXXIV—LXXXV	76
Julius Cæsar, LXXXVI—LXXXVII	79
Hamlet, LXXXVIII—XCIX	81
Othello, C	123

Addenda.

Fair Em, XX. XXIV. XXVI. XXX	125
--	-----

ANONYMOUS PLAYS.

I.

Then is there Michael, and the painter too,
Chief actors to Arden's overthrow.

ARDEN OF FEVERSHAM, III, 5 (ED. DELIUS 45).

Is *Chief* to be taken as a so-called monosyllabic foot —
followed by a trochee! — or are we to read: —

Chief actors *both* to Arden's overthrow?

II.

Tochio. Mc, Madam! 's foot! I'd be loath that any man
should make a holy-day for me yet:

In brief, 'tis thus: There's here arriv'd at court,
Sent by the Earl of Chester to the king,
A man of rare esteem for holiness,
A reverend hermit, that by miracle
Not onely sav'd our army,
But without aid of man o'erthrew
The pagan host, and with such wonder, sir,
As might confirm a kingdom to his faith.

THE BIRTH OF MERLIN, I, 1 (ED. DELIUS 5).*

* Both here, and in the passages taken from Edward III and The London Prodigal, I have not quoted the Tauchnitz Edition of the Doubtful Plays, since its text, as far as I have compared it, does not differ from that of Delius.

These lines should be thus regulated: —

Tockio. Me, madam! 'S foot! I'd be loth that any man
Should make a holiday for me yet.
In brief, 'tis thus: there's here arriv'd at court,
Sent by the Earl of Chester to the king,
A man of rare esteem for holiness,
A reverend hermit, that by miracle
Not only sav'd our army, but without
The aid of man o'erthrew the pagan host,
And with such wonder, sir, as might confirm
A kingdom to his faith.

The monosyllabic pronunciation of *madam* (in the first line) is too frequent to call for any further remark. In the second line a syllable is wanting; the regular blank verse might be restored, if we were to read: —

Should make a holiday for *my sake* yet.

III.

Prince. Nay, noble Edol, let us here take counsel,
It cannot hurt,
It is the surest garrison to safety.

THE BIRTH OF MERLIN, IV, 2 (DEL. 71).

Arrange and transpose: —

Prince. Nay, noble Edol,
Let us *take counsel here*, it cannot hurt,
It is the surest garrison to safety.

Some twenty lines lower down we meet with a striking parallel, as far as versification is concerned: —

Prince. Hold, noble Edol,
Let's hear what articles he can enforce.

IV.

Prince. Look, Edol: Still this fiery exhalation shoots
His frightful horrors on th' amazed world.

THE BIRTH OF MERLIN, IV, 5 (DEL. 74).

Arrange: —

Prince. Look, Edol:

Still this fiery exhalation shoots &c.

Still to be considered as a so-called monosyllabic foot (cf. Abbott, Shakespearian Grammar, 482), or if this should be deemed insufficient to meet the requirements of the metre, the imperative *look* to be repeated: —

Prince. Look, Edol:

Look, still this fiery exhalation shoots

His frightful horrors on th' amazèd world.

V.

Nor shall his conquering foot be forc'd to stand,
Till Rome's imperial wreath hath crown'd his fame
With monarch of the west, from whose seven hills
With conquest, and contributory kings,
He back returns —

THE BIRTH OF MERLIN, IV, 5 (DEL. 78).

Qy. read: —

With th' (or With') monarchy of th' west, &c.?

VI.

Tenebrarum precis, divitiarum et inferorum deus, hunc
Incubum in ignis æterni abyssum accipite —

THE BIRTH OF MERLIN, V, 1 (DEL. 82).

Qy. read, — *Tenebrarum princeps*, *divitiarum et inferorum deus*, &c.? Nash's *Pierce Pennilesse* is inscribed 'To the High and Mightie Prince of Darknesse,' &c.

VII.

Edw. Whose lives, my lady?

Coun. My thrice loving liege,
Your queen, and Salisbury, my wedded husband.

EDWARD III, II, 2 (DEL. 34 SEQ.).

The Countess of Salisbury has no occasion to lay stress on the king's love for her; on the contrary she thinks it incumbent on her to assure him of her own love, which is indeed no guilty, adulterous love, but that true and noble affection which every vassal and subject owes his liege. It seems, therefore, that the poet wrote: — *My thrice lovèd liege*. (Shakespeare-Jahrbuch XIII, 78 seq.)

VIII.

Next, — insomuch thou hast infring'd thy faith,
Broke league and solemn covenant made with me, —
I hold thee for a false pernitiuous wretch.

EDWARD III, III, 3 (DEL. 48).

This, I presume, is the reading of the quartos. Capell, however, (*Prolusions*; or, *Select Pieces of Antient Poetry*, London, 1760) reads *a most pernitiuous wretch*, and, in fact, it does seem that the two adjectives *false* and *pernitiuous* do not well agree with one another, although they give an unexceptionable sense. Qy. — *a false perfidious wretch*? (Shakespeare-Jahrbuch XIII, 80.)

IX.

And with a strumpet's artificial line
To paint thy vitious and deformed cause.

EDWARD III, III, 3 (DEL. 49).

Read: — *artificial line*. (Shakespeare-Jahrbuch XIII, 81.)

X.

Upon my soul, had Edward prince of Wales,
Engag'd his word, writ down his noble hand,
For all your knights to pass his father's land,
The royal king, to grace his warlike son,
Would not alone safe-conduct give to them,
But with all bounty feasted them and theirs.

EDWARD III, IV, 5 (DEL. 75).

Grammar, I think, requires either: —

Had not alone safe-conduct *given* to them,

or: —

But with all bounty *feast both* them and theirs.

As, however, these alterations might be justly thought too bold, a contraction may be suggested: —

But with all *bounty'd* feasted them and theirs,

i. e. of course, *bounty had*.

XI.

Sec. Cit. The sun, dread lord, that in the western fall
Beholds us now low brought through misery,
Did in the orient purple of the morn
Salute our coming forth, when we were known;
Or may our portion be with damned fiends.

EDWARD III, V, 1 (DEL. 82).

One or two verses seem to be wanting between the fourth and fifth line. The king thinks himself cheated, as he has required the foremost citizens of the town to be delivered to him, whereas, he says, only *servile grooms* or *felonious robbers of the sea* are forthcoming; consequently he declares his promise null and void. The second citizen, however, denies this charge and solemnly assures the king that up to that very morning he and his fellow hostages had been indeed the chiefest citizens of their town. The missing verses, therefore, may have been to the following effect: —

when we were known

To be the chiefest men of all our town;

Of this, my sovereign lord, be well assur'd,

Or may our portion be with damnèd fiends.

(Shakespeare-Jahrbuch XIII, 83.)

XII.

Wm. Cong. Ah, Marques Lubeck, in thy power it lies
To rid my bosom of these thrallèd dumps.

FAIR EM ED. DELIUS, 2. — SIMPSON, THE SCHOOL OF
SHAKSPERE, II, 408.

William confesses to Marquess Lubeck that ‘the strength of private cares subdues him more than all the world’ and that he, ‘a conqueror at arms’, is now ‘thrall’d to unarmed thoughts’. We may, therefore, well feel tempted to identify William’s dumps with these unarmed thoughts and to read *these thralling dumps* i. e. these dumps that are enthralling me. But twelve lines *antè* the Conqueror says that he turns his conquering eyes to ‘coward looks and beaten fantasies’, whence it would seem evident that *beaten fantasies* and *thrallèd dumps* are intended to denote one and the same

thing; William's fantasies and dumps have been beaten and enthralled by the power of beauty, or, as the author quaintly expresses it, by the flames of beauty blazing on Lubeck's shield. Compare Shakespeare, Sonnet CXXIV: —

It suffers not in smiling pomp, nor falls
Under the blow of thrall'd discontent,
Whereto the inviting time our fashion calls.

The Taming of the Shrew I, 1, 224: —

And let me be a slave, to achieve that maid
Whose sudden sight hath thrall'd my wounded eye.
Instead of *rid* Delius erroneously reads *aid*.

XIII.

Marq. That same is Blanch, daughter to the king,
The substance of the shadow that you saw.

FAIR EM, 8. — SIMPSON, II, 416.

S. Walker, Versification, 206 seqq., has endeavoured to show that *daughter* is sometimes used as a trisyllable, although in some cases he is doubtful, whether the passage ought not rather to be amended. In the present line the trisyllabic pronunciation of the word would imply the admission of a trochee in the third foot, which would produce a halting and inharmonious verse. Simpson has added the article *the* before *daughter*. I should prefer *sole daughter*; *sole daughter*, *sole son*, *sole child*, and *sole heir* being, as it were, proverbial phrases of almost daily occurrence. Lower down (Delius, 39. — Simpson, II, 451) we are, in fact, told that Blanch is the king's 'only daughter',

'The only stay and comfort of his life.'

Compare No. XXX.

XIV.

Ill head, worse-featur'd, uncomely, nothing courtly,
Swart and ill-favour'd, a collier's sanguine skin.

FAIR EM, 8. — SIMPSON, II, 416.

What does *Ill head* mean? We do not want a substantive here, but an adjective that will serve, as it were, as a positive to the comparative *worse-featured*. In a word, I think we ought to read *Ill-shaped*. That the shape of the lady cannot be passed over with silence becomes evident from William the Conqueror's eulogy on the beauty of Mariana twenty lines below. There he says: —

A modest countenance; no heavy sullen look;
Not very fair, but richly deck'd with favour;
A sweet face; an exceeding dainty hand;
A body, were it framed all of wax
By all the cunning artists of the world,
It could not better be proportioned.

By the way, it may be remarked that instead of *framed all of wax* Delius erroneously reads *formed &c.* The passage from The Comedy of Errors, IV, 2, 19 seqq. very aptly quoted by Simpson speaks strongly in favour of my suggestion. It is to the following effect: —

He is deformèd, crookèd, old and sere,
Ill-faced, worse-bodied, shapeless everywhere;
Vicious, ungentle, foolish, blunt, unkind,
Stigmatical in making, worse in mind.

XV.

Wm. Cong. Yes, my Lord; she is counterfeit indeed,
For there is the substance that best contents me.

FAIR EM, 9. — SIMPSON, II, 417.

Simpson proposes to read, either: —

For there is the substance that doth best content me,
or: —

For there is the substance best contenteth me.
I should prefer: —

For there *the substance is* that best contents me,
or (what would 'best content me'): —

For *there's* the substance that *contents me best*.

XVI.

Full ill this life becomes thy heavenly look,
Wherein sweet love and virtue sits enthroned.
Bad world, where riches is esteem'd above them both,
In whose base eyes nought else is bountiful!

FAIR EM, 10. — SIMPSON, II, 418 SEQ.

Is the third line perhaps to be classed with those Alexandrines of which Abbott in his Shakespearian Grammar 499 gives such curious instances? Or are we to admit an emendation and read: —

Bad world, where riches is esteem'd '*bove both?*
Chetwood, according to Simpson, reads: —

Bad world! where riches 'bove both are esteemed most.
This would be getting out of the frying-pan into the fire.
According to Delius XI, however, the line, as altered by Chetwood, seems to run thus: —

Bad world! where riches is esteemed most.

XVII.

Mount. Nature unjust, in utterance of thy art,
To grace a peasant with a princess' fame!

FAIR EM, 11. — SIMPSON, II, 419 SEQ.

For *some* Chetwood writes *frame*; neither can be right. Perhaps we should read *face* which would agree much better with Mountney's subsequent praise of 'her beauty's worthiness'. Twelve lines below Simpson needlessly adds *out* —

And she thou seekest [out] in foreign regions.
Read *seek'st* (with Delius) and pronounce *re-gi-ons*.

XVIII.

Val. Love, my lord? of whom?

Mount. Em, the miller's daughter of Manchester.

FAIR EM, 12. — SIMPSON, II, 421.

Em may be considered as a monosyllabic foot; by the repetition of *of*, however, a regular blank verse might be obtained: —

Of Em, the miller's daughter of Manchester.

XIX.

Man. Ah, Em! were he the man that causeth this
mistrust,

I should esteem of thee as at the first.

FAIR EM, 15. — SIMPSON, II, 424.

If verses of six feet are not to be admitted, the words *Ah*, *Em!* may be easily placed in what is called an interjectional line. Thirty eight lines below, however, the case is more difficult; there we read: —

Ah, Em! faithful love is full of jealousy.

Simpson's proposal to expunge *Em*, in order to restore the metre, can hardly find favour, as it is customary with our poet to add the name of the person addressed, especially

after an interjection which begins the verse. Thus, e. g.

Delius, 15. — Simpson, II, 424: —

Believe me, Em, it is not time to jest.

Delius, 16. — Simpson, II, 425: —

This, Em, is noted and too much talk'd on.*

Delius, 16. — Simpson, II, 425: —

Ah, Manvile, little wottest thou.

Delius, 17. — Simpson, II, 426: —

Nay, stay, fair Em.

Delius, 18. — Simpson, II, 427: —

Ah, Em, fair Em, if art can make thee whole.

It would, therefore, be in unison with this custom, if the poet had written: —

Ah, Em!

All faithful love is full of jealousy.

The original reading might be defended on the usual plea that the first syllable of *faithful* is to be considered as a so-called monosyllabic foot.

XX.

Two gentlemen attending on Duke William,
Mountney and Valingford, as I heard them named,
Ofttimes resort to see and to be seen.

FAIR EM, 15. — SIMPSON, II, 424.

Those critics who require regular blank verse to be restored

* Thus the line stands in Delius's edition. Simpson prints *talked* and repeats *is* before *too*; he evidently reads *noted* as a monosyllable, in accordance with the rule explained by Abbott, *Shakespearian Grammar*, 472. The repetition of *is*, however, seems needless, since the line might as well be scanned thus: —

This, Em, is not'd and too much talkèd on.

everywhere may readily correct the second line by enclosing it in a parenthesis and expunging *as*: —

(Mountney and Valingford I heard them named).

The name of *Valingford*, however, here and elsewhere seems to have been used as a dissyllable by the poet; thus, e. g. on p. 23 (II, 433) and p. 28 (II, 439), if I am not mistaken in the conviction that these passages, now printed as prose, were originally written in verse. The former passage, printed as verse, would run thus: —

'Zounds! what a cross is this to my conceit!
But Valingford, search the depth of this device.
Why may not this be some feign'd subtlety
By Mountney's invention, to th' intent
That I, seeing such occasion, should leave off
My suit, and not persist t' solicit her
Of love? I'll try th' event. If I perceive
By any means th' effect of this deceit
Procur'd by thy means, friend Mountney,
The one of us is like t' repent our bargain.

On p. 28 the following verses may be restored: —

Mount. Valingford, so hardly I digest an injury,
Thou'st proffer'd me, as, were 't not I detest
To do what stands not with the honour of my name,
Thy death should pay the ransom of thy fault.

Injury, in the first line, is to be pronounced as a dissyllable. The second line is printed from Simpson's text; Delius reads — *As were it not that I detest*. Which of the two editions — if either of them — may represent the reading of the quartos, I do not know. In regard to the third line cf. Abbott, Shakespearian Grammar, 499. It cannot be denied, however, that another, and perhaps a safer, arrangement might be devised, viz. —

Mount. Valingford,
So hardly I digest an injury,
Thou'st proffer'd me, &c.

XXI.

Ah me, whom chiefly and most of all it doth concern,
To spend my time in grief, and vex my soul, &c.

FAIR EM, 16. — SIMPSON, II, 425.

Dele — *chiefly and*.

XXII.

I speak not, sweet, in person of my friend,
But for myself, whom, if that love deserve
To have regard, being honourable love;
Not base affects of loose lascivious love,
Whom youthful wantons play and dally with,
But that unites in honourable bands of holy rites,
And knits the sacred knot that God's —

FAIR EM, 17. — SIMPSON, II, 426 SEQ.

Instead of *loose lascivious love* read *loose lascivious lust*. Compare *antē* (Delius, 6. — Simpson, II, 413): —

Let not vehement sighs,
Nor earnest vows importing fervent love,
Render thee subject to the wrath of lust —
which Chetwood has wrongly altered to *the wrath of love*. —
For the faulty repetition of *love* cf. No. XXX and No. LXIX.
In the last line but one omit *honourable* before *bands*; it is likewise owing to faulty repetition.

XXIII.

Em. Speak you to me, sir?

Mount. To thee, my only joy.

Em. I cannot hear you.

Mount. O plague of fortune! O hell without compare!
What boots it us, to gaze and not enjoy!

FAIR EM, 18. — SIMPSON, II, 427.

I cannot agree with Simpson, who remarks on the fourth line — ‘Dele *oh*’ [before *hell*]. — Instead of *enjoy* in the fifth line Simpson suggests *hear*, which, he adds, would rhyme with *compare*. Apart from this somewhat questionable rhyme, *hear* cannot be right, since it is applicable only to Em. According to my conviction a verb or phrase is wanted which applies to both Em and Mountney, for Mountney asks, *What boots it us?* Qy. *and not converse?* Or a line to the following effect may have dropped out: —

and not enjoy

The sweet converse of mutual love between us.

XXIV.

Val. But is it [Delius: it is] possible you should be taken on such a sudden? Infortunate Valingford, to be thus cross'd in thy love! — Fair Em, I am not a little sorry to see this thy hard hap. Yet nevertheless, I am acquainted with a learned physician that will do anything for thee at my request. To him will I resort and inquire his judgment, as concerning the recovery of so excellent a sense.

FAIR EM, 22. — SIMPSON, II, 432.

Val. No? Not the thing will do thee so much good? Sweet Em, hither I came to parley of love, hoping to have

found thee in thy wonted prosperity. And have the gods so unmercifully thwarted my expectation, by dealing so sinisterly with thee, sweet Em?

FAIR EM, 22. — SIMPSON, II, 432.

These passages I take to be two more instances of metrical composition that have degenerated into prose by the negligence or ignorance of transcribers and compositors. With the aid of a few alterations the first passage may be thus restored: —

Inf fortunate Valingford, to be thus cross'd
In love! — Fair Em, I'm not a little sorry
To see this thy hard hap, yet ne'ertheless
I am acquainted with a learn'd physician
That will do any thing for thee
At my request; to him will I resort
And will inquire his judgment as concerning
Th' recovery of so excellent a sense.

After the third line a verse seems to be wanting. The fifth line may be easily extended to a regular blank verse by the addition of *he can* after *any thing*. The second passage may have come from the poet's pen in the following shape: —

No? Not the thing will do thee so much good?
Sweet Em, I hither came to parle of love
Hoping t' have found thee in thy wonted state;
And have the Gods thwart'd so unmerc'fully
My hope, by dealing so sinisterly
With thee?

Em. Good sir, no more. It fits not me

To have respect to such vain phantasies &c.

The words *Sweet Em* in the sixth line (after *thee*) are an unquestionable interpolation. *Prosperity* and *expectation*, on the other hand, cannot be removed without some violence; but

most of the so-called pseudo-Shakespearean plays have been handed down to us in a state of such rank corruption, that a critic who attempts to amend them, must be allowed to walk 'with a larger tether' than is granted elsewhere.

XXV.

Val. Yet, sweet Em, accept this jewel at my hand,
Which I bestow on thee in token of my love.

FAIR EM, 23. — SIMPSON, II, 432.

The words of address should form an interjectional line and the verses be regulated thus: —

Val. Yet, sweet Em,
Accept this jewel at my hand, which I
Bestow on thee in token of my love.

Chetwood, who wants the words *Em* and *on thee* to be expunged, is evidently wrong.

A similar instance occurs a few pages farther on (Delius, 32. — Simpson, II, 443): —

Em. Trotter, lend me thy hand; and as thou lovest me, keep my counsel, and justify whatsoever I say, and I'll largely requite thee.

By a few slight alterations the following verses may be restored: —

Em. Trotter,
Lend me thy hand, and as thou lovest me
Pray keep my counsel, and justify *whatever*
I say, and *largely* I'll requite thee.

Let me add a third passage (Delius, 33. — Simpson, II, 444): —

Em. Good father, let me not stand as an open gazing-stock to every one, but in a place alone, as fits a creature so miserable.

Arrange and read: —

Em. Good father,
Let me not stand an open gazing-stock
To every one, but in a place alone
That fits a creature *that's* so miserable.

XXVI.

Wm. Hence, villains, hence! How dare you lay
your hands
Upon your sovereign!
Sol. Well, sir; will deal for that.
But here comes one will remedy all this.

FAIR EM, 35 SEQ. — SIMPSON, II, 447.

In the first line Simpson reads *Dare you [to] lay*, and in the third line *we will deal for that*. The reading of the quartos is nowhere given. The second and third line, in my opinion, should be joined and corrected thus: —

Upon your sovereign!
Sol. Well, we'll deal for that.

XXVII.

Soldier. My lord, watching this night in the camp
We took this man, and know not what he is.

FAIR EM, 36. — SIMPSON, II, 447.

Is the first line to be scanned as a verse of four feet: —

My lord, watching this night in th' camp?
A trochee in the second place would be unusual, to say the least. Or is *lord* to be pronounced as a dissyllable? Cf. Marlow's Tragedy of Edward II ed. by the Rev. F. G. Fleay,

London, 1877, p. 117. Or are we to call in the aid of an emendation and read: —

My lord, *in* watching this night in the camp?

Compare sixteen lines lower down: —

In knowing this, I know thou art a traitor.

XXVIII.

Wm. Cong. In knowing this, I know thou art a traitor;
A rebel and mutinous conspirator.

Why, Demarch; know'st thou who I am?

FAIR EM, 36. — SIMPSON, II, 448.

Simpson adds the indefinite article before *mutinous* and thus produces a verse of six feet. The line is quite right as it stands, since *rebel* is to be pronounced as a monosyllable. In the third line Simpson reads *knowest*, a trochee that restores the metre of the verse. *Why* is, of course, to be considered as a so-called monosyllabic foot.

XXIX.

Wm. Cong. Where's Lord Dirot?

Dem. In arms, my gracious lord,
Not past two miles from hence,
As credibly I am ascertained.

FAIR EM, 37. — SIMPSON, II, 449.

Arrange and read: —

Dem. In arms, my gracious lord, not past two miles
From hence, as credibly I'm ascertain'd.

In the first line Simpson reads *Where is*, against the metre.

XXX.

Amb. Marry thus: the king of Denmark and my
Sov'reign

Doth send to know of thee, what is the cause,
That, injuriously, against the law of arms
Thou hast stol'n away his only daughter Blanch,
The only stay and comfort of his life?
Therefore, by me
He willeth thee to send his daughter Blanch
Or else forthwith he will levy such an host,
As soon shall fetch her in despite of thee.

FAIR EM, 39. — SIMPSON, II, 451.

Arrange and read: —

Amb. Marry thus:

The king of Denmark and my sovereign
Doth send to know of thee, what is the cause,
That thou hast stol'n, against the law of arms,
Injuriously away his daughter Blanch,
The only stay and comfort of his life?
Therefore by me he willeth thee to send her,
Or else forthwith he'll levy such an host,
As soon shall fetch her in despite of thee.

The reiterations of *only* in the fourth and fifth, and of *his daughter Blanch* in the fourth and seventh lines are evident 'diplographies', if this technical term of German critics may be introduced into English; it might, I think, conveniently supersede the somewhat heavy and vague circumlocution of S. Walker, Crit. Exam., I, 276. A similar instance of diplography has occurred already in No. XXII. Critics of such thorough-going conservatism as to shield even glaring diplographies, may perhaps prefer to read the third and fourth lines thus: —

That, 'gainst the law of arms, injuriously
 Thou 'st stol'n away his only daughter Blanch.

The sixth and seventh lines have been contracted by Chetwood into the following: —

Therefore by me he wills thee send her back.
 Needlessly bold and needlessly harsh.

XXXI.

Are not you Merchants, that from East to West,
 From the Antarcticke to the Arctick Poles,
 Bringing all treasure that the earth can yeeld?

HISTRIO-MASTIX, APUD SIMPSON, THE SCHOOL OF
 SHAKSPEARE, II, 44 SEQ.

Read: — *Bring in all treasure.* — *Qy. Pole?*

XXXII.

Flow. Sen. I' faith, sir, according to the old proverb:
 The child was born, and cried,
 Became a man, after fell sick, and died.

THE LONDON PRODIGAL, I, 1. — MALONE, SUPPLEMENT,
 II, 455. — HAZLITT, THE SUPPLEMENTARY WORKS OF
 WM. SHAKSPEARE, 209.

After, in the last line, looks like an interpolation and should be expunged. By the way, it may be remarked that in Mr Carew Hazlitt's English Proverbs and Proverbial Phrases this 'old proverb' is not to be found.

XXXIII.

Sir Lane. Where is this inn? We are past it, Daffodil.

Daf. The good sign is here, sir, but the back gate
is before.

THE LONDON PRODIGAL, I, 2. — MAL., II, 462. — HAZ., 212.

Qy. read, — *The gate sign* instead of *The good sign*. — According to Malone, the folio as well as the modern editions read *the black gate*; instead of which Malone has restored *the back gate* from the quarto.

XXXIV.

Arti. Why, there 'tis now: our year's wages and our vails will scarce pay for broken swords and bucklers that we use in our quarrels. But I'll not fight if Daffodil be o' t' other side, that's flat.

THE LONDON PRODIGAL, II, 4. — MAL., II, 480. — HAZ., 222.

Read, — *in your quarrels*. The servants do not use their swords and bucklers in their own quarrels, but in those of their masters. 'Sir', says Artichoke to Sir Lancelot, his master, towards the close of the scene, 'we have been scouring of our swords and bucklers for your defence.'

XXXV.

M. Flow. Now, God thank you, sweet lady. If you have any friend, or garden-house where you may employ a poor gentleman as your friend, I am yours to command in all secret service.

THE LONDON PRODIGAL, V, 1. — MAL., II, 517. — HAZ., 241.

Read: *if you have any field or garden-house*. *Friend* crept in, by anticipation, from the following line.

XXXVI.

Flying for succour to their dankish caves.

MUCEDORUS ED. DELIUS, 4. — ED. WARNEKE AND
PRÆSCHOLDT, 22. — HAZLITT'S DODSLEY, VII, 204.

My conjectural emendation *dankish* has been received into the text by Messrs Warnke and Præscholdt; the old editions read *Danish*, a reading which cannot lay claim to a gentler appellation than that of nonsense. *Dankish* occurs in the Comedy of Errors, V, 1, 247: —

And in a dark and dankish vault at home.

Another emendation may, however, be offered, viz. *dampish*. Cf. The Birth of Merlin, IV, 1 (ed. Delius 69): —

Then know, my lord, there is a dampish cave,
The nightly habitation of these dragons,
Vaulted beneath &c.

The Play of Stucley 668 (Simpson, The School of Shakspeare, I, 185): —

When we are lodged within the dampish field.

XXXVII.

Seg. [*Aside*] This seems to be a merry fellow.

MUCEDORUS, DEL., 13. — W. AND PR., 32. — H'S D., VII, 213.

A regular blank verse would be restored by the insertion of *very* before *merry*. That *very* was frequently interpolated has been shown by S. Walker, Crit. Exam., I, 268 seq. Cf. also No. XLI. Here we meet with an instance of its omission.

XXXVIII.

Mouse. I think he was, for he said he did lead a salt-seller's life about the woods.

Seg. Thou wouldst say, a solitary life about the woods.

MUCEDORUS, DEL., 42. — W. AND PR., 64. — H's D., VII, 245.

Read: — a *solitary's* life about the woods.

XXXIX.

God grant her grace amongst us long may reign,
And those that would not have it so,
Would that by Envy soon their hearts they might forego.

Com. The council, and this realm,
Lord, guide it still with thy most holy hand!
The commons and the subjects, grant them grace,
Their prince to serve, her to obey, and treason to deface:
Long may she reign in joy and great felicity,
Each Christian heart do say Amen with me! [*Exeunt.*

MUCEDORUS, W. AND PR., 77. — H's D., VII, 260.

These verses, which conclude the play in the quarto of 1598, have been transmitted to us in a state of such degeneracy as cannot be laid to the author's door, however poor a versifier he may have been. The second line consists of four, the third of six feet; the words *Would that*, which begin the third line, have simply slipped down from the second to the third line, or rather they were written in the margin and inserted in the wrong place by the compositor. For *realm* in the fourth line, however unexceptionable it may be *per se*, *land* should be substituted, as with this single exception the concluding speech of Comedy is in rhyme. This alteration is, moreover, supported by the concluding prayer in *The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London* (Dodsley ed. Hazlitt, VI, 501 seq). There we read: —

Her council wise and nobles of this land
Bless and preserve, O Lord! with thy right hand.

Whether or not the line should be filled up, it is difficult to decide, as it would, at the same time, involve the question, whether, instead of *guide it* in the following line, we should not read *guide them*. Both may be easily done, if the requisite boldness be conceded to the emendator. May not the author have written, e. g.: —

The council and the nobles of this land

Lord, guide them still with thy most holy hand?

Of the two clauses *Their prince to serve* and *her to obey* in the seventh line one — most probably the second — is certainly a gloss and must be expunged; and the last line but one may be easily reduced to five feet either by the omission of *joy and* or of *great* before *felicity*, in which latter case *felicity* is to be pronounced as a trisyllable (flicity).* The corresponding line in the concluding prayer of The Three Lords and Three Ladies of London runs as follows: —

Lord! grant her health, heart's-case, [*and*] joy and
mirth.

The whole passage, therefore, would seem to have come originally from the author's pen in about the following shape: —

God grant her Grace amongst us long may reign,
And would that those that would not have it so,
By Envy soon their hearts they might forego.

Com. The council and the nobles of this land,
Lord, guide them still with thy most holy hand!

* Felicity as a trisyllable occurs in Sir Thomas More's *Utopia* ed. Arber 167: —

Wherefore not Utopie, but rather rightely
My name is Eutopie: A place of felicity.

See Abbott, *Shakespearian Grammar*, 468.

The commons and the subjects, grant them grace,
 Their prince to serve and treason to deface:
 Long may she reign in joy and felicity,
 Each Christian heart do say Amen with me!

XL.

My power has lost her might, and Envy's date's expired,
 Yon splendent majesty has 'felled my sting,
 And I amazed am.

MUCEDORUS, DEL., 55. — W. AND PR., 78. — H's D., VII, 259.

And before *Envy's* has been added by the editors. The second line is wanting in the quartos of 1621 and 1668 and consequently in Delius's edition also. In my opinion, the three lines should be thus arranged: —

My power has lost her might, and Envy's date
 Expired is; yon splendent majesty
 Has 'fell'd my sting, and I amazèd am.

Or should we alter *Envy's* to *my*? A text so grossly corrupted as that of Mucedorus cannot be healed without boldness, although the less bold an emendation is, the greater claim it possesses on our approval. Now, if we read *my*, not only the addition of *and* would be spared, but also the division of the lines would remain untouched: —

My power has lost her might, my date's expir'd,
 Yon splendent majesty has 'felled my sting,
 And I amazèd am.

XLI.

I thankt him, and so came to see the Court,
Where I am very much beholding to your kindness.

NO-BODY AND SOME-BODY, APUD SIMPSON, THE SCHOOL
OF SHAKSPERE, I, 322.

Dele *very* in the second line. Compare S. Walker, Crit. Exam.
I, 268 seqq. See also No. XXXVII.

XLII.

Ens. Lieutenant, he 's a gallant gentleman,
We know it well, and he that is not willing
To venture life with him, I would for my part
He might end his days worser than the pestilence.

THE PLAY OF STUCLEY, APUD SIMPSON, THE SCHOOL
OF SHAKSPERE, I, 185.

Dele *He* in the last line and write *th' pestilence*.

CHAPMAN.

XLIII.

Give me the master-key of all the doors.

ALPHONSUS ED. ELZE, 43 AND 133.

The old editions read: —

Boy, give me the master-key of all the doors.

Another instance to the same effect occurs on p. 52 (cf. p. 135)
where the old editions read: —

Madam, that we have suffer'd you to kneel so long.
In both cases I have thought myself justified by the metre
in expunging the words of address *Boy* and *Madam*, as no

doubt such words may frequently have been interpolated by the actors. In the edition of Chapman's Works (Plays) by Richard Herne Shepherd (London, 1874) where my text of Alphonsus has been followed remarkably closely, without the least acknowledgment, *Boy* has been omitted, whilst *Madam* has been restored from the old edition. There are, however, two other ways of satisfying the requirements of the metre; one is, to place the words *Boy* and *Madam* in interjectional lines: —

Boy,

Give me the master-key &c.,

the other, to restore the metre by contractions: —

Boy, gíve | me th' má | ster-key' | of áll | the doórs,
and: —

Ma'am, thát | we've súf | fer'd you | to kneél | so lóng.
I now feel convinced that this last way was the poet's own scansion. (Anglia, herausgegeben von Wülcker und Trautmann, I, 344 seq.)

GREENE.

XLIV.

K. Hen. He shall, my lord; this motion likes me well.
We'll progress straight to Oxford with our trains,
And see what men our académy brings. —
And, wonder Vandermast, welcome to me:
In Oxford shalt thou find a jolly friar,
Call'd Friar Bacon, England's only flower.

FRIAR BACON AND FRIAR BUNGAY, SC. 4. — THE DRAMATIC
AND POETICAL WORKS OF R. GREENE AND G. PEELE
ED. DYCE, 159.

Dyce suggests *wondrous Vandermast* (he might have compared *wondrous Merlin*, *The Birth of Merlin* ed. Delius, 75), where-

as Prof. Ward (Marlowe's Tragical History of Doctor Faustus and Greene's Honourable History of Friar Bacon and Friar Bungay, Oxford, 1878, 220) sees no reason to alter the text and compares such compounds as A.-S. *wundor-werc*, or *wonder storie* (in The Knight's Tale [line?]) and *wonder chance* (in The Man of Lawes Tale 5465) to which he might have added *wonder thyng* in The Towneley Mysteries (Marriott, Collection of English Miracle Plays 138). But is the present case, where we have to deal with a proper name, to be classed unhesitatingly with such compounds? Are we not reminded involuntarily of Shakespeare's 'so rare a wonder'd father' (The Tempest, IV, 1, 122) and tempted to write *wonder'd Vandermast*? But our doubts are not even here at rest. Ferdinand when speaking of his rare-wondered father has just witnessed Prospero's 'most majestic and charmingly harmonious vision'. King Henry, however, has not yet seen the slightest proof of Vandermast's magic art; what reason has he to address him as a wonder, or a wondered artist? The Emperor, in presenting Vandermast to the king, has indeed praised his accomplishments, but he has been still more eloquent on the travels which the learned doctor has undertaken. Would it not, therefore, be much more to the purpose to read *wander'd Vandermast*? Compare Henry VIII, I, 3, 19: —

The reformation of our travell'd gallants,
That fill the court with quarrels, talk, and tailors.

MARLOWE.

XLV.

Myc. Well, here I swear by this my royal seat —
Cos. You may do well to kiss it then.

The second line, in my opinion, should be completed by the addition of *Mycetes*: —

You may do well to kiss it then, *Mycetes*.

XLVI.

Tamb. Stay, Techelles; ask a parle first.

I TAMBURLAINE, I, 2 (WORKS 11a).

The metre, I think, requires *parley*. The first foot of the line (*Stay*) is monosyllabic. Compare No. IV.

XLVII.

And made a voyage into Europe.

2 TAMBURLAINE, I, 3 (WORKS 49a).

‘A word’, says Dyce, ‘dropt out from this line.’ I think not, but am persuaded, that Marlowe wrote *Europa*. Cf. R. Chester’s *Loves Martyr* ed. Grosart (for the New Shakspeare Society) 24: —

Welcome immortal Bewtie, we will ride
 Ouer the Semi-circle of Europa,
 And bend our course where we will see the Tide,
 That partes the Continent of Affrica,
 Where the great cham gouernes Tartaria:
 And when the starry Curtaine vales the night,
 In Paphos sacred Ile we meane to light.

The shortening of the penult in *Eúropa* will not seem strange when we compare *Eúphrates* (I Tamburlaine V, 2; Works 36b) and *Sármata* (Marlowe, First Book of Lucan, Works 377a), beside the wellknown *Hypérion*, *Titus Andrónicus* and others. False quantity in classical proper names

seems to be privileged. Cf. Marlowe's Doctor Faustus &c. ed. A. W. Ward p. 271 seq. S. Walker, Versification, 172 seq.

XLVIII.

My lord, here comes the king, and the nobles,
From the parliament. I'll stand aside.

EDWARD II. — WORKS, 184a. — MARLOW'S EDWARD II
ED. FLEAY, 51.

Although this is the reading of all the four quartos (1594, 1598, 1612 and 1622), the text must nevertheless be pronounced corrupt; the vocative *My lord* has no antecedent to which it might refer, and the verse, moreover, consists only of four feet. Dyce, therefore, transposes the words and reads *Here comes my lord the king*, an emendation which is greatly preferable to Cunningham's suggestion *By'r lord, here comes the king*; for Marlowe, as Mr. Fleay justly remarks, never makes use of similar oaths and protestations, and if he did, we should be prepared rather for *By'r lady* than for *By'r lord*. Mr Fleay himself tries to heal the corruption by a different arrangement of the lines: —

Here comes my lord

The king and th' nobles from the parliament.

I'll stand aside.

In my opinion this is far from being an improvement. Dyce's reading is no doubt the most acceptable, and would meet all wishes, if it did complete the verse, which might be effected by the addition of a single monosyllabic: —

Here comes my lord the king and *all* the nobles

From th' parliament. I'll stand aside.

(Anglia, herausgegeben von Wülcker und Trautmann I, 348.)

XLIX.

But tell me, Mortimer, what's thy device
Against the stately triumph we decreed? &c.

EDWARD II (WORKS 194b). — FLEAY, 69.

A very apt illustration of these and the following lines is contained in the following passage from Neumayr von Ramssla, Johann Ernsten des Jüngern, Hertzogen zu Sachsen, Reise &c. (Leipzig, 1620) S. 179: 'Endlichen zeigte man I[hro] F[ürstlichen] G[naden] eine kleine *Galeria* [viz. at Whitehall], etwa 20 Schritt lang, so hinauss auffm Fluss gebawet, darinn hiengen auff beyden Seiten etliche hundert Schild von Pappen gemacht, daran waren allerley *emblemata* vnd Wort gemahlet vnd geschrieben. Wann Frewdenfest seynd, pflegen die Höffischen solche *inventiones* zu machen, vnd damit auffzu-ziehen. Wer nun was sonderlichs vnd denckwürdigis erfunden, dessen Schild wird zum Gedächtnis dahin gehengt. Hinden am Ende dieses Gangs, ist der Gang etwas grösser, in solchem hiengen auch dergleichen schilde.'

SHAKESPEARE AND FLETCHER.

L.

You most coarse freeze capacities; ye jane judgements.

THE TWO NOBLE KINSMEN, III, 5; ED. LITLEDALE, 52
AND 144 SEQ.

Mr Harold Littledale, the latest editor of this play, extends his note on the above line to an explanation of the much discussed phrase *Up-see Freeze*; *Freeze* he thinks to be equivalent with *Friesland Beer* and *up-see* to mean *drunk, halfseas-over*. This explanation, however, has long been superseded. After what has been said by Nares s. v. and myself in my

edition of Chapman's *Alphonsus* 138 seq. I should not revert to the subject, if I were not able to bring forward some fresh passages that go far to show that *Upsee Freeze* or *Upsee Dutch* means 'in the Frisian or Dutch manner.' The first of these passages occurs in *A Pleasant Comedie of Pasquill and Katherine*, A. II (Simpson, *The School of Shakspeare*, II, 165):—

Pour wine, sound music, let our bloods not freeze.

Drink Dutch, like gallants, let's drink upsey freeze.

That is to say, the English gallants of the time used to drink in the Dutch or Frisian fashion, i. e. with the German drinking ceremonies, for Dutch, here as elsewhere, means German, and it is a wellknown fact that the German drinking ceremonies at that time had spread over Holland and even reached England. John Taylor, the Waterpoet, in his account of his journey to Hamburgh (*Three Weeks, Three Daies &c.*, Works, 1872, 3) says: 'and having upse-freez'd four pots of boon beer as yellow as gold' &c., which words I take to mean, having drunk four pots of beer after the Frisian manner. That '*Upsee Frieze cross*' means to drink with interlaced arms (*Brüderschaft trinken*), as I have conjectured, is confirmed by Nash, *Summer's Last Will and Testament* (apud Dodsley, 1825, IX, 49): 'A vous, monsieur Winter, a frolick upsy freeze: cross, ho! super nagulum.' That is, let us cross or interlace our arms, as the Germans do when drinking *Brüderschaft*, and let us 'drench' our glasses 'to the bottom' so that what is left may stand on the thumb-nail. This, in German, is called to this day *die Nagelprobe machen*, and still forms part of the ceremony of drinking *Brüderschaft*. — A fourth allusion to 'Upsy Freeze' is contained in a work of much later time, viz. in Johann Georg Forster's *Briefwechsel herausgegeben von Th[erese] H[uber], geb. H[eyne]* (Leipzig, 1829) II, 671; it is in an English letter dated Overberg's

Contrays, August 27, 1775, and addressed to George Forster by the distinguished Swedish naturalist Andreas Sparrmann. 'Dear Sir', he writes, 'I'll have the pleasure by means of this letter to shake hands with you *'op sein goede Africanse Boers'*; for, as I have now for some time been in quarters by the Owerbergse peasants, you must give me leave to follow the customs of these good folks, who, without any other roundabout compliments, present their sharp hands, as the New Zealanders their carved noses, when a cordial salute is meant.' — There can be no doubt that *op sein goede Africanse Boers* means, 'in the true manner of the African Boers.' (Anglia, herausgegeben von Wülcker und Trautmann I, 347 seq.)

SHAKESPEARE.

LI.

This wide-chapp'd rascal — would thou mightst lie
drowning

The washing of ten tides!

THE TEMPEST, I, I, 60 SEQ.

I do not recollect whether or not any editor has already remarked that these words contain an allusion to the singular mode of execution to which pirates were condemned in England. 'Pirats and robbers by sea', says Harrison (Description of England ed. Furnivall, London, 1877, 229) 'are condemned in the court of admeraltie, and hanged on the shore at lowe water marke, where they are left till three tides haue ouerwashed them.' According to Holinshed III, 1271, seven pirates were hanged on the riverside below London, on March 9,

1577—8. (Anglia, herausgegeben von Wülcker und Trautmann I, 338).

Prof. John W. Hales (in The Academy of Sept. 1, 1877, 220) has corroborated the above remark by two passages from Greene's *Tu Quoque* and from Stow, apud Dodsley ed. Hazlitt XI, 188. He also refers to the description of the Execution Dock at Wapping, in Murray's Handbook for Kent. 'Ten tides', he justly adds, 'are of course a comic exaggeration, three tides being no sufficiently severe punishment for "this wide-chapp'd rascal", the boatsman'.

LII.

This blue-eyed hag was hither brought with child
And here was left by sailors.

THE TEMPEST, I, 2, 270 SEQ.

Staunton and Mr P. A. Daniel (Notes and Conjectural Emendations 9) ingeniously propose *blear-eyed*. In favour of this suggestion it may be added that Reginald Scot, in his *Discoverie of Witchcraft*, B. I, Chap. 3 (apud Drake, Shakspeare and his Times II, 478), writes indeed that witches 'are women which be commonly old, lame, *bleare-eyed*, pale, fowle, and full of wrinkles.' Mr Wright, on the other hand, in his annotated edition of this play, sustains the reading of the folio; '*blue-eyed*', he says, 'does not describe the colour of the pupil of the eye, but the livid colour of the eye-lid, and a blue eye in this sense was a sign of pregnancy'; in proof of which Mr Wright quotes a passage from Webster's *Duchess of Malfi*. Nowhere indeed, if not in the passage under discussion, does Shakspeare mean the colour of the pupil, when speaking of blue eyes, but the livid circles round the eyes or the bluish eyelids; thus, e. g., in *As You Like It*, III,

2, 393: 'a blue eye and sunken'. This, I think, admits of no doubt, and is corroborated by a passage in Spenser's *Faerie Queene* I, 2, 45, where the poet ascribes 'blue eyelids' to Duessa when she has swooned and lies seemingly dead: —

Her eyelids blew
And dimmed sight with pale and deadly hew
At last she gan up lift.

Here too the adjective 'blue' is to be taken in its old sense, viz. 'livid'; see Mr Skeat's *Etymological Dictionary* s. v. Blue.

It would be of no common interest to know exactly what Shakespeare meant by 'grey eyes' and what colour of the eyes stood highest in favour with Elizabethan England. Until some such information be exhumed a doubt may remain concerning the 'blue-eyed hag', as a very different explanation seems to be suggested by some passages in a living American poet, from which it might be inferred that, in popular belief, blue eyes may possibly have been thought characteristic of witches. Mr J. G. Whittier, who is evidently conversant with the particulars of those persecutions for witchcraft that so darkly fill the pages of early American history, says (*The Vision of Echard and Other Poems*, Boston, 1878, 22): —

A blue-eyed witch sits on the bank
And weaves her net for thee;

and again on p. 26: —

Her spectre walks the parsonage,
And haunts both hall and stair;
They know her by the great blue eyes
And floating gold of hair.

I merely throw this out as a hint, but, as it seems to me, the subject is deserving of further investigation.

LIII.

Pro. Goe make thy selfe like a Nymph o' th' Sea,
 Be subiect to no sight but thine, and mine: inuisible
 To euery cyc-ball else: goe take this shape
 And hither come in't: goe: hence
 With diligence. [*Exit.*

Pro. Awake, deere hart awake, thou hast slept well,
 Awake.

THE TEMPEST, I, 2, 301 SEQQ.

The above reading of the folio has been handled by the editors in a somewhat strange and violent manner. In the first line, Pope and almost all his followers have added *to* before *a Nymph*; this preposition is indeed taken from the later folios and, as will be shown, cannot be omitted, on account of the metre. Those editors who do not agree to its insertion transpose the words *Be subject* from the beginning of the second to the end of the first line. In the second line most editors have struck out *thine and*, partly in order to reduce the line to six feet, partly because they thought the word 'an interpolation of ignorance', as Steevens terms it. Dyce goes so far as to stigmatise the poor words, although contained in all the folios, as 'most ridiculous'. Such high words, I regret to say, are no arguments; this kind of criticism amounts to correcting the poet himself, if correcting it be, instead of his copyists and printers. In the fourth line Ritson and others have omitted *goe* before *hence*, and, in consequence, have been obliged to write *in it* instead of *in't*. After all these alterations it is no wonder that modern texts read very differently from what has been transmitted in the folio; in Dyce's third edition the passage stands thus: —

Go make thyself like to a nymph o' th' sea,
 Be subject to no sight but mine; invisible
 To every eyeball else. Go take this shape,
 And hither come in't: hence with diligence.

The last line is not exempt from the faults of weakness and lameness and it speaks greatly in favour of the old text that, the less it is altered, the better verses are obtained; there is indeed no occasion whatever to depart from it, except in the addition of the preposition *to* in the first line and in the arrangement of the lines, which would appear originally to have been this: —

Go, make thyself like to a nymph o' th' sea:
 Be subject to no sight but thine and mine,
 Invisible to every eyeball else.
 Go, take this shape and hither come in't: go hence
 With diligence. *[Exit Ariel.]*
 Awake, dear heart, awake! thou hast slept well;
 Awake!

I do not know whether this arrangement has been already given in some one or other of the innumerable editions of the poet or not; all I can say is that I have never met with it. Whether or not the second *go*, in the fourth line, is to be divided from the following words by a colon may be left to the reader's own judgment; it does not affect the arrangement proposed. With the words *Go, take this shape* Prospero, of course, gives Ariel the garment which is to render him invisible to everybody's eyes except his (viz. Ariel's) own and those of his master. (Robinson's *Epitome of Literature*, Philadelphia, March 15, 1879; Vol. III, 48.)

LIV.

My prime request,
Which I do last pronounce, is, O you wonder!
If you be maid or no?

THE TEMPEST, I, 2, 426 SEQQ.

Made in the fourth folio is an evident gloss; the sense is, 'If you be an (unmarried) mortal woman or a goddess?' Compare *The Birth of Merlin*, II, 2 (ed. Delius 33): —

Aur. It is Artesia, the royal Saxon princess.

Prince. A woman and no deity? no feign'd shape,
To mock the reason of admiring sense,
On whom a hope as low as mine may live,
Love, and enjoy, dear brother, may it not?

Compare also *Odyss.* VI, 149 where Ulysses addresses Nausicaa in the following words: —

γοννοῖμαι σε ἀνασσα· θεός νύ τις ἢ βροτός ἐσσι κ. τ. λ.

LV.

Be of comfort;
My father's of a better nature, sir,
Than he appears by speech: this is unwonted
Which now came from him.

THE TEMPEST, I, 2, 495 SEQQ.

This would imply, that Prospero generally made a less favourable impression by his speeches than by his actions, which, of course, is not what Miranda means to say. It is, on the contrary, only this one speech just uttered that shows him to disadvantage, and this speech, as Miranda assures Ferdinand, is unwonted. Read therefore: —

Than he appears *by's* speech: &c.

In order to 'make assurance double sure', it may be added that *by's* occurs in John Taylor the Waterpoet's pamphlet entitled *The Water-Cormorant his Complaint &c.* (London, 1622) at the end of the 'Satire on A Figure flinger, or a couzning cunning man': —

And though the marke of truth he neuer hits,

Yet still this Cormorant doth liue by's wits &c.

(Shakespeare-Jahrbuch VIII, 376).

LVI.

Gon. All three of them are desperate: their great guilt,
Like poison given to work a great time after,
Now 'gins to bite the spirits.

THE TEMPEST, III, 3, 104 SEQQ.

Mr P. A. Daniel corrects *their spirits*; compare however A Warning for Fair Women A. II, l. 1381 (Simpson, The School of Shakspeare II, 322): —

The little babies in the mothers' arms

Have wept for those poor babies, seeing me,

That I by my murther have left fatherless.

In my humble opinion, this use of the article instead of the possessive pronoun is no corruption of the text, but a looseness of speech on the part of the author, which it is not the office of the critic to correct; all critics, however, know from their own experience how extremely difficult it is always to keep clear from errors and mistakes in distinguishing between the peculiarities and inaccuracies of a writer and the lapses of his transcribers and printers.

LVII.

Come, shadow, come, and take this shadow up,
 For 'tis thy rival. O thou senseless form,
 Thou shalt be worshipp'd, kiss'd, loved and adored!
 And were there sense in his idolatry,
 My substance should be statue in thy stead.

THE TWO GENTLEMEN OF VERONA, IV, 4, 202 SEQQ.

The word *statue* cannot be right, and the attempts that have been made to amend it (Hanmer conjectured *sainted*, and Warburton *statued*) are still less satisfactory. I think we should read *shadow*, on which word Julia is evidently playing. *Shadow*, in Shakespeare, is usually opposed to *substance*, so that also in the above line it seems to be almost necessitated by the preceding *substance*. This conviction is still strengthened when we recall the verses in A. IV, Sc. 2, where Proteus asks for Silvia's picture and Silvia promises to send it: —

Pro. Madam, if your heart be so obdurate
 Vouchsafe me yet your picture for my love,
 The picture that is hanging in your chamber;
 To that I'll speak, to that I'll sigh and weep:
 For since the substance of your perfect self
 Is else devoted, I am but a shadow;
 And to your shadow will I make true love.

Jul. [*Aside*] If 'twere a substance, you would, sure,
 deceive it,

And make it but a shadow, as I am.

Sil. I am very loath to be your idol, sir;
 But since your falsehood shall become you well
 To worship shadows and adore false shapes,
 Send to me in the morning and I'll send it:
 And so, good rest.

Compare also: —

Love like a shadow flies, when substance love pursues.

THE MERRY WIVES OF WINDSOR, II, 2.

He takes false shadows for true substances.

TITUS ANDRONICUS, III, 2.

That same is Blanch, [sole] daughter to the king

The substance of the shadow that you saw.

FAIR EM ED. DELIUS, 8. — SIMPSON, THE SCHOOL
OF SHAKSPERE, II, 416.

It need scarcely be remarked that *shadowe*, in the last-quoted passage, stands for the picture of Lady Blanch. (Robinson's Epitome of Literature, March 15, 1879; Vol. III, 48.)

LVIII.

And the quaint mazes in the wanton green

For lack of tread are undistinguishable:

The human mortals want their winter cheer;

No night is now with hymn or carol blest:

Therefore the moon, &c.

A MIDSUMMER-NIGHT'S DREAM, II, 1, 99 SEQQ.

There is not much less confusion in the order of these lines than in the altered seasons themselves. The arrangement, proposed by Dr Johnson, however, contains no improvement commensurate with its violence. I think an easier way of healing the corruption may be found. The lines: —

The human mortals want their winter cheer;

No night is now with hymn or carol blest,

should be placed after: —

Fall in the fresh lap of the crimson rose.

Theobald's ingenious suggestion *cheer* instead of *here*, although withdrawn by its author, has been rightly taken up by Dyce; indeed, we cannot do without it. The sense is, 'we see the seasons alter; we have "snow in the lap of June" and summer in winter, so that we can enjoy neither summer nor winter; the mortals are deprived of their usual winter enjoyments, and no night is blessed with Christmas hymns or carols.' (The Athenæum, Oct. 26, 1867, 537.)

LIX.

Can you not hate me, as I know you do,
But you must join in souls to mock me too?

A MIDSUMMER-NIGHT'S DREAM, III, 2, 149 SEQ.

The second line, although Dyce is silent about it, is certainly corrupt. Hanmer conjectured *in flouts*; Mason, *in soul*; Tyrwhitt, *ill souls*; Warburton, *but must join insolents*. According to my conviction Shakespeare wrote: —

But you must join in *taunts* to mock me too?

The usual abbreviation 'taūts', if the stroke were obliterated, or altogether left out, could be easily misread for 'fouls'. (The Athenæum, Oct. 26, 1867, 537.)

LX.

Merry and tragical! tedious and brief!

That is hot ice and wondrous strange snow.

A MIDSUMMER-NIGHT'S DREAM, V, 1, 58 SEQ.

Hanmer proposed *and wondrous scorching snow*; Warburton, *a wondrous strange shew*; Upton, and Capell, *and wondrous strange black snow*; Mason, *and wonderous strong snow*; Collier,

and Grant White (Shakespeare's Scholar 220), *and wondrous seething snow*; Staunton, *and wondrous swarthy snow*; Nicholson, *and wondrous staining snow*. The Editors of the Globe Edition have prefixed their well-known obelus to the line. There can be no doubt that the epithet must refer to the colour, and not to the temperature, of the snow; for as ice is the symbol and quintessence of coldness, so is snow of whiteness and purity. Compare, e. g., Psalm 51, 7: Purge me with hyssop and I shall be clean, wash me and I shall be whiter than snow. Hamlet, III, 1, 140: be thou as chaste as ice, as pure as snow. Hamlet, III, 3, 46: —

Is there not rain enough in the sweet heavens

To wash it white as snow?

The incongruity, with the ice, therefore, lies in the temperature; with the snow, in the colour. In so far, Staunton's conjecture *swarthy* highly recommends itself; it is, indeed, the only one that is acceptable among those that have been published hitherto. I imagine, however, that Shakespeare wrote: —

That is, hot ice and wondrous *sable* snow.

To a transcriber or compositor of Shakespeare's works, the words *wondrous strange*, from their frequent occurrence, were likely to present themselves even when uncalled for. (The Athenæum, Oct. 26, 1867, 537.)

LXI.

Tongue, lose thy light;

Moon, take thy flight;

Now die, die, die, die, die. [*Exit Moonshine.*]

A MIDSUMMER-NIGHT'S DREAM, V, 1, 309.

This nonsense can never have come from Shakespeare's pen. The word *tongue* is entirely out of place here and

has evidently crept in from Thisbe's next speech (the antistrophe): —

Tongue, not a word:

Come, trusty sword;

Come, blade, my breast imbrue.

Mr Halliwell-Phillipps has conjectured *sun* for *tongue*; but Pyramus has nothing to do with the sun, and such an address to sun and moon would be too truly pathetic in his mouth. Besides, Pyramus does not address the moon, but rather Moonshine and his Dog, and *tongue*, in my opinion, is nothing but a mistake for *dog*. This granted, we have only to transpose the words *Dog* and *Moon*, and the natural flow of thoughts and words seems fully restored: —

Moon, lose thy light,

Dog, take thy flight,

Now die, die, die, die, die. [*Exit Moonshine.*

(The Athenæum, Oct. 26, 1867, 537).

LXII.

My wind cooling my broth

Would blow me to an ague, when I thought

What harm a wind too great at sea might do.

THE MERCHANT OF VENICE, I, I, 22 SEQQ.

Wind is here understood by the commentators and translators to mean 'breath'. The repetition of the word, however, first in this unusual and immediately after in its customary sense, must 'give us pause', since no pun is intended; it seems natural, to take the word in both places in the same sense. Besides, nobody is able to blow himself to an ague by his own proper breath; on the contrary, that which produces an

ague must come from somewhere else, it must be a wind, in the ordinary sense of the word, and not a breath. The pronoun 'my' does not subvert this explanation; it is used colloquially and redundantly in the same manner as 'me' or 'your'. Thus, e. g., King John I, 1, 189 seqq.: —

Now your traveller,

He and his toothpick at my worship's mess;

And when my knightly stomach is suffic'd,

Why then I suck my teeth, and catechize

My picked man of countries.

Or Ben Jonson, Volpone, IV, 1: —

Read Contarene, took me a house,

Dealt with my Jews to furnish it with moveables &c.

Abbott, Shakespearian Grammar 220 seq., has omitted to mention this redundant use of 'my'. (Shakespeare - Jahrbuch XI, 275.)

LXIII.

How like a fawning publican he looks.

THE MERCHANT OF VENICE, I, 3, 42.

Messrs Clark and Wright in their annotated edition of this play take exception to the above line. 'A "fawning publican", they say, 'seems an odd combination. The Publicani or farmers of taxes under the Roman government were much more likely to treat the Jews with insolence than servility. Shakespeare, perhaps, only remembered that in the Gospels "publicans and sinners" are mentioned together as objects of the hatred and contempt of the Pharisees.' — The learned editors have overlooked that the poet evidently alludes to St. Luke 18, 10—14, where the publican fawns — not indeed on men, but — in Shylock's opinion — on God. Such a

prostration before God, proceeding from a humility which is a characteristic of Christianity rather than of Judaism does not enter into Shylock's soul. Shylock lends a deaf ear to Portia's glorious panegyric of mercy; he will neither show, nor accept mercy. He 'stays on his bond' not only in his relations to his fellow-men, but also in his relations to his Creator. 'What judgment shall I dread, doing no wrong?' and 'My deeds upon my head!' he exclaims, in the true spirit of Judaism. Marlowe's Barabas (A. I) speaks in the very same key: —

The man that dealeth righteously shall live;
And which of you can charge me otherwise?

But Shylock is not only incapable of sympathizing with the publican that prostrates himself in the dust and cries for mercy, he is even averse to what he deems an abject behaviour; he hates such a man and brands his humility as fawning. (Shakespeare-Jahrbuch XI, 276.)

LXIV.

Shy. Signior Antonio, many a time and oft
In the Rialto you have rated me
About my moneys and my usances.

THE MERCHANT OF VENICE, I, 3, 107 SEQQ.

Roger Wilbraham (An Attempt at a Glossary of Some Words used in Cheshire, London, 1836, under 'Many a time and oft') says: 'A common expression and means, frequently. — — With which colloquial expression, though common through all England, Mr. Kean, the actor in the part of Shylock, being unacquainted, always spoke the passage, by making a pause in the middle of it, thus: "Many a time — and oft on the

Rialto", without having any authority from the text of Shakespeare for so doing.' Compare also Forby, Vocabulary of East Anglia s. v. Many-a-time-and-often: 'a pleonasm or rather tautology, sufficiently ridiculous, but in very familiar use.'

LXV.

The young gentleman, — — is indeed deceased, or, as you would say in plain terms, gone to heaven.

THE MERCHANT OF VENICE, II, 2, 64 SEQQ.

Launcelot Gobbo delights in saying things by contraries; he advises his father to 'turn down indirectly to the Jew's house' and assures Bassanio that the suit is 'impertinent' to himself. May he not be speaking here in the same style, so much the more so as the 'plain term' in question is *to go to hell* rather than *to go to heaven*? He does not, however, pronounce the ominous word, but after some hesitation corrects himself. The actor therefore should make a significant pause before 'heaven', and we should write, *or, as you would say in plain terms, gone to — heaven*. A similar humorous innuendo is contained in the well-known poem of Burns 'Duncan Gray', St. 3: —

Shall I, like a fool, quoth he,

For a haughty hizzie die?

She may gae to — France for me!

Ha, ha, the wooing o't.

I quote from Allan Cunningham's edition (London, 1842, in 1 vol., 450). In the second line, I think, we should write *dee* for *die*. (Shakespeare-Jahrbuch XI, 277 seq.)

LXVI.

How doth that royal merchant, good Antonio?

THE MERCHANT OF VENICE, III, 2, 242.

The distinguishing title here given to Antonio is repeated in IV, 1, 29: — Enow to press a royal merchant down. It is by no means to be considered as a mere *epitheton ornans*, by which the poet wishes to define the social position and princely magnanimity of Antonio, but it is also a genuine *terminus technicus* for a wholesale merchant or rather for what was formerly called a merchant adventurer. This is shown by a passage in Thomas Powell's pamphlet *Tom of all Trades*; or, *The plaine Pathway to Preferment* (1631), which is reprinted in Mr Furnivall's edition of *Tell-Trothes New-Yeares Gift* (Publications of the New Shakspere Society, Ser. VI, No. 2, 164 seq.). 'I admit', says Thomas Powell, 'the Merchant Royall that comes to his Profession by travaile and Factory, full fraught, and free adventure, to be a profession worthy the seeking. But not the hedge-creeper, that goes to seeke custome from shop to shop with a Cryll under his arme, That leapes from his Shop-boord to the Exchange, and after he is fame-falne and credit crackt in two or three other professions, shall wrigle into this and that when he comes upon the Exchange, instead of enquiring after such a good ship, spends the whole houre in disputing, whether is the more profitable house-keeping, either with powder Beefe, and brewes, or with fresh Beefe and Porridge; though (God wot) the blacke Pot at home be guilty of neyther: And so he departs when the Bell rings, and his guts rumble, both to one tune and the same purpose. The Merchant Royall might grow prosperous, were it not for such poore patching interloping Lapwings that have an adventure of two Chaldron of Coles at New-castle; As much oyle in the Greeneland fishing

as will serve two Coblers for the whole yeare ensuing. And an other at Rowsie [i. e. Russia], for as many Fox-skins as will furre his Longlane gowne, when he is called to the Livorie.' (Anglia, herausgegeben von Wülcker und Trautmann I, 340.)

LXVII.

Bear your body more seeming, Audrey.

AS YOU LIKE IT, V, 4, 72.

In support of Mr P. A. Daniel's admirable emendation *more swimming*, the following passages may be added to those that have been quoted by Mr Daniel himself. Chapman, The Ball, A. II (The Works of Geo. Chapman: Plays ed. R. H. Shepherd, 494): 'Carry your body in the swimming fashion. — Ben Jonson, Epigrams No. LXXXII (Works, in 1 vol., London 1853, 671): —

Surly's old whore in her new silks doth swim:

He cast, yet keeps her well! No; she keeps him.

From among modern writers the distinguished American poet William Cullen Bryant may be cited as giving proof of the sense in which the phrase is understood. In his poem 'Spring in Town' he says: —

No swimming Juno gait, of languor born,

Is theirs, but a light step of freest grace,

Light as Camilla's o'er the unbent corn.

These quotations, I think, are sufficient to remove all doubts and to clear the way for the admittance of Mr Daniel's ingenious correction into the text, so much the more as the phrase 'to bear oneself or one's body seeming' can hardly be supported by a single parallel passage. (Shakespeare-Jahrbuch XI, 284.)

LXVIII.

As Stephen Sly and old John Naps of Greece.

THE TAMING OF THE SHREW, INDUCTION, II, 95.

For the private amusement of himself and friends the poet has introduced in this Induction allusions to some well-known inns and boon companions of his own county; recollections, no doubt, of the haunts and acquaintances of his youth. Such, probably, were old Sly and his son of Burton (or Barton)-on-Heath, if they should not be meant for Edmund Lambert and his son John (cf. Elze, William Shakespeare, 64 and 80); such also Marian Hacket, the fat ale-wife of Wincot, i. e. Wilmecote, which, according to Staunton's note ad loc., is to this day popularly pronounced Wincot. With these I do not hesitate to couple *old John Naps of Greece*; Greece being a palpable corruption, which is neither remedied by Blackstone and Hanmer's *old John Naps o' th' Green*, nor by Mr Halliwell-Phillipps's *old John Naps of Greys* or of *Greete*, which latter, Mr Halliwell-Phillipps says, was a place situated between Stratford and Gloucester. On the map of Warwickshire I find a place called Cleeve Priory, on the Avon, a few miles below Stratford. Shakespeareans who are acquainted from personal knowledge with the topography of Warwickshire, which I am sorry to say I am not, can decide whether this be a place likely to have been the residence of old John Naps; if so, I should propose to read: —

As Stephen Sly and old John Naps of *Cleeve*.

This conjecture, I think, is strengthened by our poet's allusion in *Romeo and Juliet*, II, 4, 83 seq., to 'bitter-sweetings', a kind of apple which was, and is to this day, 'grown especially at Cleeve and Littleton' and is still used as a sauce, in complete accordance with Mercutio's words in the passage cited. See John R. Wise, *Shakspeare: His Birth-*

place and its Neighbourhood (London, 1861) 97. (The Athenæum, Jan. 18, 1868, 95. Reply by Mr Halliwell-Phillipps ib. Jan. 25, 1868, 133. — Shakespeare's dramatische Werke nach der Uebersetzung von Schlegel und Tieck, herausgegeben von der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft VII, 120.)

LXIX.

To suck the sweets of sweet philosophy.

THE TAMING OF THE SHREW, I, 1, 28.

S. Walker (Crit. Exam. I, 289) has rightly classed this line among that species of corruption which he calls 'substitution of words', where a particular word is substituted for another 'which stands near it in the context, more especially if there happens to be some resemblance between the two'; in fact, it is what in Germany is called a diplography, i. e. a faulty repetition of the same or a similar word (see Nos. XXII and XXX). Walker, however, has left the verse without correction, whilst an anonymous conjecturer, according to the Cambridge Edition, proposes *fair philosophy*. The context, I think, clearly shows the true reading to be: —

To suck the sweets of *Greek* philosophy.

(The Athenæum, Jan. 18, 1868 p. 95).

LXX.

O yes, I saw sweet beauty in her face,

Such as the daughter of Agenor had.

THE TAMING OF THE SHREW, I, 1, 172 SEQ.

In order to restore the rhyme Mr Collier's so-called manuscript-corrector has substituted *of Agenor's race* for *of Agenor had*.

Dyce, however, both in his *Strictures on Mr Collier's New Edition of Shakespeare*, 72, and in his second edition of *Shakespeare's Works*, has shown that by this alteration the meaning is destroyed and the grammar violated. Should the line have rhymed originally, — and I am inclined to this belief, — another, though still bolder, conjecture might serve the purpose: —

O yes, I saw her *in sweet beauty clad*,
Such as the daughter of Agenor had.

LXXI.

Luc. Fiddler, forbear; you grow too forward, sir:
Have you so soon forgot the entertainment
Her sister Katharine welcomed you withal?

Hor. But, wrangling pedant, this is
The patroness of heavenly harmony: &c.

THE TAMING OF THE SHREW, III, I, 1 SEQQ.

To complete the fourth line is no very difficult task, and it has been performed by almost all editors; their conjectures, however, are mere guesses and do not give us the least explanation as to how the mutilation may have originated. Not to speak of Theobald's and Hanmer's conjectures, nothing less can be said of Mr Collier's *I avouch this is* or of W. N. Lettsom's *This is a Cecilia*. The poorest expedient seems to me S. Walker's arrangement (*Versification*, 85), which proves that in criticism, as well as in poetry, even Homer may sometimes take a nap. Any attempt to heal this gap which should lay claim to something better than an 'airy nothing' ought of itself to indicate the way in which the beginning of the line became lost; for, in my opinion, the loss took place at the

beginning, and not in the body, or at the end, of the line. I imagine that Shakespeare wrote: —

Her sister — *but!* But, wrangling pedant, this is &c.

The copyist or compositor omitted the first two words because he had just written them or set them up in the same place in the preceding line, and the third was overlooked through its similarity to the following *but*. The copyist or compositor catching this *but*, fancied that he had already written or set up the three preceding words. (The Athenæum, Jan. 18, 1868, p. 95).

LXXII.

Pet. Come, where be these gallants? Who's at home?

Bap. You 're welcome, sir.

Pet. And yet I come not well.

Bap. And yet you halt not.

Tra. Not so well apparell'd

As I wish you were.

Pet. Were it better, I should rush in thus.

But where is Kate? Where is my lovely bride?

How does my father? — Gentles, methinks you frown.

THE TAMING OF THE SHREW, III, 2, 89 SEQQ.

The arrangement and disposition of this passage is, no doubt, corrupt. It is an unfit remark in Petruchio's own mouth that he does not come well, nor does it harmonize with his subsequent question — 'And wherefore gaze this goodly company?' On the contrary he would have the company believe that he comes quite well as he comes, and that he gives no occasion for staring at him. This difficulty is, indeed, removed by the ingenious conjecture of Capell; there are, however, others still remaining. I do not think it likely that

Tranio should join in the conversation at its very beginning; moreover, it is not his business to express a wish about Petruchio's apparel. The words 'Not so well apparell'd as I wish you were' evidently belong to Baptista; and in the old piece, the corresponding words ('But say, why art thou thus basely attired?') are in fact spoken by the father of the bride. In so far I agree with W. N. Lettsom's arrangement, apud Walker, Crit. Exam. III, 68. For the emendation of the following verse, 'Were it better, I should rush in thus', a number of conjectures have been offered. Its supposed corruption, however, merely arises from a misunderstanding, or rather misconstruction. All the editors, whom I have been able to collate, refer these words to the preceding lines; their meaning, according to Dyce, being, 'Were my apparel better than it is, I should yet rush in thus.' But the pointing of the folio which has a colon after 'thus' shows that the line is to be connected with the following verses; and the position of 'thus' at the end of the line confirms this construction. Petruchio, in answer to Baptista's reproaches, here imitates an amorous coxcomb and asks if it were better to have come in after *this* manner, and with *these* questions. With the words, 'Gentles, methinks you frown', he resumes his own manner and tone. Only on the stage can the truth of this interpretation be made fully apparent. The passage should accordingly be printed: —

Pet. Come, where be these gallants? Who 's at home?

Bap. You 're welcome, sir; and yet you come not well.

Pet. And yet I halt not.

Bap. Not so apparell'd as I wish you were.

Pet. Were it better I should rush in thus? —

[*Imitating a coxcomb.*

But where is Kate? Where is my lovely bride?

How does my father? (*Resuming his own manner again.*)

Gentles, methinks you frown.

In the first line, S. Walker (Crit. Exam. II, 144) proposes to read *Come, come*; it may, however, as well begin with what is called a monosyllabic foot. In the correction of the fourth line W. N. Lettsom has led the way by expunging *well* before *apparell'd*; he also substitutes *Nor* for *Not*, whereas in my arrangement the original reading is retained. (The Athenæum, Jan. 18, 1868, 95).

LXXIII.

Welcome; one mess is like to be your cheer.

Come, sir; we will better it in Pisa.

THE TAMING OF THE SHREW, IV, 4, 70 SEQ.

Capell's alteration has been conclusively refuted by Dyce. The metre of the second line might be thus restored: —

Come, sir; we *soon* will better it in Pisa.

Or, if a verse of four feet should be thought admissible, *we will* may be contracted: —

Come, sir; *we'll* better it in Pisa.

(The Athenæum, Jan. 18, 1868, 95).

LXXIV.

I frown the while, and perchance wind up my watch, or
play with my some rich jewel.

TWELFTH NIGHT, II, 5, 65 SEQ.

I regret that I cannot agree with Mr P. A. Daniel's interpretation of this passage (Notes and Conjectural Emendations, 43). For, if in fact persons of rank, apart from collars of knighthood, and similar badges of honour, wore jewels

suspended from the neck (of which I am not certain), yet these jewels could hardly serve as playthings. In my opinion the poet rather has in view a jewel hanging from the watch, or worn in a ring. Compare, e. g., *The Womanhater* IV, 2 (Dodsley ed. Hazlitt IV, 358): —

Be full of bounty; velvets to furnish a gown, silks
For petticoats and foreparts, shag for lining;
Forget not some pretty jewel to fasten, after
Some little compliment.

Or Jeronimo, (Dodsley ed. Hazlitt IV, 358): —

Let his protestations be
Fashioned with rich jewels.

I should prefer therefore to read *with some rich jewel*, although the ingenious emendation proposed by Mr Daniel might just as well be understood in the sense indicated by me. The pointing by which the Cambridge Editors endeavour to uphold the reading of the folio is too artificial to be taken for Shakespeare's own punctuation.

LXXV.

Here's a stay
That shakes the rotten carcass of old Death
Out of his rags.

KING JOHN II, I, 455 SEQ.

This is the reading of the folio, of which W. N. Lettsom has justly remarked, that '*stay* is perhaps the last word that could have come from Shakespeare.' Johnson has conjectured *flaw* which S. Walker (*Crit. Exam.* II, 294) thinks 'is indisputably right'; it bears, however, too little resemblance to the old reading, and, besides, the idea of a gust of wind seems to be

foreign to the context. The same objections lie against Mr Spedding's conjectures of *storm* and *story*. Beckett and Singer propose *say* which is far too weak in the mouth of the Bastard. I think we should read, — *Here's a bray*. The Heralds both of the besiegers and the besieged play a conspicuous part in this scene and have just opened the parley with the blowing of their trumpets; King Philip says (II, 1, 204 seq.): —

You loving men of Angiers, Arthur's subjects,
Our trumpet call'd you to this gentle parle.

Under such circumstances the citizen of Angiers may be said not inappropriately to 'bray out' his defiance to the kings like a 'harsh-resounding' trumpet (see K. Richard II, I, 3, 135: With harsh-resounding trumpets' dreadful bray) and, in the Bastard's language, by such a clang to shake 'the rotten carcass of old Death out of his rags.' Compare Hamlet, I, 4, 11 seq.: —

The kettledrum and trumpet thus bray out
The triumph of his pledge —

and Edward III, I, 2 (ed. Delius, 9): —

How much they will deride us in the North;
And in their vile, uncivil, skipping jigs,
Bray forth their conquest and our overthrow,
Even in the barren, bleak, and fruitless air.

See also Milton's English Poems, ed. R. C. Browne (London, 1873) I, 228 and 367. (The Athenæum, June 22, 1867, 821. — Shakespeare's dramatische Werke nach der Uebersetzung von Schlegel und Tieck, herausgegeben von der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft I, 235.)

LXXVI.

The grappling vigour and rough frown of war
Is cold in amity and painted peace.

KING JOHN, III, 1, 104 SEQ.

Hanmer reads *cool'd*; Capell, *clad*; Staunton proposes *coil'd*, and Mr Collier's corrected folio has *faint in peace*. Mr Collier's manuscript corrector, whoever he may have been, has rightly felt the want of symmetrical agreement between the two clauses of the second line, but the remedy by which he has meant to restore it, seems to be wrong. I rather incline to the belief that Shakespeare wrote: —

Is *scolding* amity and painted peace.

Constance reproaches King Philip with perjury, and denounces his warlike preparations as a sham; they are, she says, not more dreadful than amity that scolds a friend or peace which is painted to look like war. The required harmony of the sentence is thus very naturally recovered; and I need not dwell on the easy misapprehension by which the words *Is scolding*, particularly when spoken, can be transmuted into *Is cold in*. (The Athenæum, June 22, 1867, 821. Shakespeare's dramatische Werke nach der Uebersetzung von Schlegel und Tieck, herausgegeben von der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft I, 238).

LXXVII.

First Exec. I hope your warrant will bear out the deed.

Hub. Uncleanly scruples! fear not you; look to 't.

KING JOHN, IV, 1, 6 SEQ.

According to Schmidt, Shakespeare-Lexicon s. v., *uncleanly* is used by Shakespeare not only in its literal, but also in a moral sense = indecent, unbecoming. This moral sense Schmidt

ascribes to the word in the following three passages, viz. As You Like It, III, 2, 49; Othello, III, 3, 138 seqq.; and the present line from King John. In the first-named passage Corin and Touchstone are talking of 'good manners at the court' as opposed to country manners. 'You told me', says Corin, 'you salute not at the court, but you kiss your hands: that courtesy would be uncleanly, if courtiers were shepherds.' Being asked for his reason, he adds, 'We are still handling our ewes, and their fells, you know, are greasy'. From the context it is evident that *uncleanly* is here used in its literal, not in its figurative, meaning; which latter is to be found only in the other two passages. But this does not remove the doubts that cling to those *Uncleanly scruples*, with which Hubert reproaches the executioner, for the executioner's scruples are cleanly and decent rather than otherwise; he endeavours to keep clean from responsibility. Grey conjectured *unmanly*, but I have little doubt that we should read: —

Unseemly scruples! fear not you! look to 't.

These scruples, says Hubert, do not beseem a man of so low a station as you are. (The Athenæum, June 22, 1867, 821. — Shakespeare's dramatische Werke nach der Uebersetzung von Schlegel und Tieck, herausgegeben von der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft I, 242).

LXXVIII.

When your head did but ache,
I knit my handkercher about your brows,
The best I had, a princess wrought it me,
And I did never ask it you again;

And with my hand at midnight held your head,
 And like the watchful minutes to the hour,
 Still and anon cheer'd up the heavy time,
 Saying, 'What lack you?' and 'Where lies your grief?'
 Or 'What good love may I perform for you?'

KING JOHN, IV, I, 41 SEQQ.

Arthur clearly means to say, 'Just as the watchful minutes cheer up the long, slow hour, so did I cheer up the heavy time by my repeated, sympathizing questions.' It seems, therefore, that we should read: —

And, like the watchful minutes *do* the hour,
 Still and anon cheered up the heavy time.

That *like* was not unfrequently used in the sense of *as*, has been shown by S. Walker, Crit. Exam. II, 115 seqq. 'In provincial English', says Mr Earle (The Philology of the English Tongue, 214) '*like* is still now used as a conjunction: he behaved like a scoundrel would.' Compare Forster's Life of Dickens (I, 263, Tauchnitz Ed.): 'Nobody shall miss her like I shall.' Abbott's Shakespearian Grammar is silent about this use of the word, although instances in point occur in The Tempest, III, 3, 65 seq.: —

my fellow-ministers

Are like invulnerable —

and in A Midsummer-Night's Dream, IV, 1, 170 seq.: —

But, like in sickness, did I loathe this food;

But, as in health, come to my natural taste, &c.

The old editions, it is true, read *like a sickness*, but this evident mistake was corrected by Farmer and all subsequent editors have adopted his correction. Compare also the passage from Hugh Holland quoted farther on (No. XCII): —

though my braines Apollo warmes;
 Where, like in Jove's, Minerva keeps a coile.
 (Notes and Queries, Feb. 7, 1874, 116. — Shakespeare-Jahrbuch XI, 284 seq.).

LXXIX.

If what in rest you have, in right you hold &c.

KING JOHN, IV, 2, 55.

Steevens conjectured *in wrest*; Jackson, *int'rest*; an anonymous scholar, *in rent*; Staunton, *If what in rest you have, not right you hold*. King John has nothing *in rest*, but, on the contrary, every thing in unrest; he is full of fears and has to contend with enemies both abroad and at home. Pandulph very justly says (III, 4, 131 seq.): —

It cannot be

That, whiles warm life plays in that infant's veins,

The misplaced John should entertain an hour,

One minute, nay, one quiet breath of rest.

To tell the king, that he has the kingdom *in wrest* would ill become the speaker, even if such an abbreviation for *in your wrest* or *in your grasp*, were Shakespearean, of which I do not feel sure. These difficulties, I think, might be avoided by reading: —

If what in *trust* you have, by right you hold.

Government is entrusted to the king; he holds it for the benefit of his country and subjects. This is by no means a modern sentiment or foreign to Shakespeare's time. Holinshed puts almost the very same words into the mouth of the Archbishop of Canterbury at the coronation of King John; 'a man', he makes him say of the king, 'I doubt not

that for his owne part will apply his whole indeavour, studie and thought vnto that onelie end, which he shall perceiue to be most profitable for the commonwealth, as knowing himself to be borne not to serue his owne turne, but for to profit his cuntrye and to seeke for the generall benefit of us that are his subjects.' In Richard II, IV, 1, 126, the king is characterized by the Bishop of Carlisle as God's 'captain, steward, deputy-elect' and in III, 3, 78, Richard himself says: —

If we be not, show us the hand of God

That hath dismiss'd us from our stewardship.

(Shakespeare's dramatische Werke nach der Uebersetzung von Schlegel und Tieck, herausgegeben von der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft I, 243 seq. — Shakespeare-Jahrbuch XI, 285 seq.).

LXXX.

For I do see the cruel pangs of death

Right in thine eye.

KING JOHN, V, 4, 59 SEQ.

Right in thine eye certainly gives a sense, but so weak and poor a sense that it is beneath Shakespeare. It can neither be supported by Coriolanus, III, 3, 70: —

Within thine eyes sat twenty thousand deaths,
nor by Byron, *The Island*, I, 4: —

Full in thine eyes he waved the glittering blade.

Right, in our passage, is merely an expletive. Hanmèr and Warburton therefore conjectured *Pight in thine eye* (*eyes*); Capell, *Fight in thine eye*; Mr Collier's so-called manuscript corrector, *Bright in thine eye*; Brae, *Riot in thine eye*. This last suggestion has been cited by Dr Ingleby (Shakespeare

Hermeneutics, or The Still Lion, London, 1875, 116) with 'unqualified satisfaction'. Mr Collier's conjecture, although approved by Singer and Knight, has been incontrovertibly refuted by Dyce *ad loc.* I think the compositor anticipated *right* from the following line ('that intends old right') and am convinced that the true reading is: —

For I do see the cruel pangs of death

Writhing thine eye.

(The Athenæum, June 22, 1867, 821. — Shakespeare's dramatische Werke nach der Uebersetzung von Schlegel und Tieck, herausgegeben von der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, 2. Aufl., I, 247. The first edition I, 247, has the misprint *Whithin* for *Writhing*.)

LXXXI.

Enter BASTARD *and* HUBERT, *seuerally*.

Hub. Whose there? Speake hoa, speake quickly,
or I shoote.

Bast. A Friend. What art thou?

Hub. Of the part of England.

Bast. Whether doest thou go?

Hub. What's that to thee?

Why may not I demand of thine affaires,

As well as thou of mine?

Bast. Hubert, I thinke.

Hub. Thou hast a perfect thought.

KING JOHN, V, 6, 1st SEQQ.

This is the reading of the folio and it need not be pointed out that, as far as the distribution of the speeches is concerned, it is a perfect tangle. Attempts at emendation have

been made by W. W. Lloyd, Dyce (3d Ed. V, 98), and Mr H. H. Vaughan (New Readings and New Renderings of Shakespeare's Tragedies, London, 1878, I, 84 seq.). Dyce differs from the folio only in the following lines: —

Hub. What's that to thee?

Bast. Why may not I demand
Of thine affairs, as well as thou of mine?
Hubert I think.

He adopts, he says, as absolutely necessary, this portion of the new distribution of the speeches at the commencement of this scene which was recommended to him by W. W. Lloyd. Mr Vaughan proposes the following arrangement: —

Hub. Who's there? Speak ho! speak quickly, or I
shoot.

Bast. A friend: what art thou?

Hub. Of the part of England.
Whither dost thou go?

Bast. What is that to thee?

Hub. 'What's that to thee?' — Why may not I
demand

Of thine affairs — as well as thou of mine?

Bast. Hubert, I think.

Hub. Thou hast a perfect thought.

Thus, Mr Vaughan says, the metre becomes perfect, whereas, according to him, the metrical defect is not remedied by Dyce's arrangement. In my opinion both Dyce's and Mr Vaughan's alterations are insufficient and do not improve the text; of Mr Lloyd's arrangement, as it is not contained in his Critical Essays on the Plays of Shakespeare (London 1875), I know nothing except what has been imparted by Dyce. If we bear in mind that throughout the play the Bastard is hot-headed, aggressive and over-bearing, whereas

Hubert is of a sedate temperament and generally stands on his defence, it will seem quite natural that it is not the latter, but the former, who opens the dialogue with the impetuous question: Who's there? Speak, ho!, to which he immediately adds a threat. It speaks greatly in favour of this supposition that in the stage-direction the name of the Bastard is placed first. I feel therefore convinced that the verses should be distributed as follows: —

Bast. Who's there? Speak, ho! speak quickly, or I

Hub. A friend. [shoot.

Bast. What art thou?

Hub. Of the part of England. —

Whither dost thou go?

Bast. What's that to thee?

Hub. Why may not I demand

Of thine affairs as well as thou of mine?

Bast. Hubert, I think.

Hub. Thou hast a perfect thought.

(Shakespeare's dramatische Werke nach der Uebersetzung von Schlegel und Tieck, herausgegeben durch die Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, I, 247. — The Athenæum, June 22, 1867.)

LXXXII.

Let it be so: and you, my noble prince,

With other princes that may best be spared,

Shall wait upon your father's funeral.

KING JOHN, V, 7, 96 SEQQ.

S. Walker (Crit. Exam. I, 293) believes the word *princes* to be a corruption, the transcriber's or compositor's eye having been caught by the word *prince* in the preceding line. Dyce and

the Cambridge Editors concur in this opinion, without, however, making any attempt at restoring the passage. The compositor, in my opinion, by mistake repeated a wrong word from the preceding verse; instead of *princes* he ought to have repeated *nobles*, for Shakespeare in all probability wrote: —

With other *nobles* that may best be spared.

(The Athenaeum, June 22, 1867, 821. — Shakespeare's dramatische Werke nach der Uebersetzung von Schlegel und Tieck, herausgegeben von der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, I, 248.)

LXXXIII.

Enter Will Kemp.

ROMEO AND JULIET, IV, 5 (QB).

The account of Will Kemp's life and doings as given by Dyce in the Introduction to 'Kemp's Nine Daies Wonder' (printed for the Camden Society, 1840), singular though it be, has yet been far surpassed by the wild hypotheses concerning it advanced by the late R. Simpson (The School of Shakspeare, II, 373 seq.). Simpson is the only critic, as far as I am aware, who pretends to a knowledge of Kemp's whereabouts before 1587. This knowledge he derives from the pseudo-Shakespearean comedy of 'Fair Em' to which he imparts a symbolical meaning and which he imagines to refer to events in the history of the stage. William the Conqueror, the hero of that comedy, according to Simpson, is no other than William Kemp, who, he fancies, went to Denmark in 1586, at the head of a company of actors, in order to marry the princess Blanch, that is, in order 'to make himself the master of the Danish stage.' 'But on his

arrival there', continues Simpson, 'he was more struck with the chances of another career, and very soon eloped to Saxony, to turn his histrionic talents to more account there.' This fact, Simpson fancies, was shadowed forth by the change that takes place in the sentiments of William the Conqueror. 'Mounteney and Valingford', our critic goes on to say, 'are two of his company whom he would have taken with him, but who preferred to stay behind, and contend for the prize of the Manchester stage, which Lord Strange's players were then bringing into repute.' The second part of the plot carries on the history of this Manchester contention. 'The windmill, with its clapper and its grist, is the type of the theatre; the wind is either the encouraging breath of the audience, or the voice of the actors, the clapper the applause, and the grist the gains. The miller's daughter is the prize; he who wins her bears the bell as play-wright.' — As this second part of Simpson's explanation has nothing to do with Will Kemp, I dismiss it with the question, what the verdict of English critics might have been, had a German started such a theory.

There is not a single argument to support Kemp's supposed journey to Denmark and Saxony; nay such a journey is utterly improbable. Putting aside for the moment Kemp's 'Dutiful Inuective' (1587) of which I shall speak more at large hereafter, we find Kemp first mentioned in 1589, if we take it for granted that Nash's undated tract 'An Almond for a Parrot' which is inscribed to William Kemp was published in this year. In the dedication Kemp is complimented as the 'vice-gerent generall to the Ghost of Dicke Tarlton'; and in Heywood's 'Apologie for Actors' (43) we are likewise told that Kemp succeeded Tarlton, who died in September, 1588, 'as wel in the favour of her majesty, as in the opinion and good

thoughts of the generall audience.' The question, therefore, arises whether it is likely that Kemp, if he had really proceeded in 1586 to Denmark and thence to Saxony, could have been back again in England as early as the end of 1588 or the beginning of 1589, nay, if he really were the author of the 'Dutiful Inuective' which appeared in 1587, his stay in foreign parts must dwindle down to less than a twelvemonth. But travelling in those days was no such easy pastime as it is now-a-days, and certainly we must allow Kemp some time both in Denmark and Germany for the exercise of his profession. Besides, Kemp in 1588, in all probability, was a very young man, for he himself tells us that in 1599 when performing his famous morris-dance from London to Norwich, he 'judged his heart cork and his heels feathers, so that he thought he could fly to Rome or at least hop to Rome, as the old proverb is, with a mortar on his head.' We cannot possibly believe him to have been a man advanced in years in 1599, else he would certainly not have been able to undergo the fatigues of a feat so unheard of and never surpassed. Supposing then that he was about thirty-five years old when dancing to Norwich, he would in 1586 have numbered little more than twenty years, an age at which we can hardly believe him to have gone abroad at the head of a company of players. Moreover it is highly probable that from 1589 to 1593 Kemp belonged to Edward Alleyn's company, for his 'Applauded Merrimentes of the Men of Gotcham' are contained in the most pleasant and merry Comedy 'A Knacke to knowe a Knaue', which was published in 1594 and acted in 1592 by Alleyn's company; this, as Dyce justly remarks, would scarcely have been the case, had not Kemp been a member of the company and himself performed a part in his Applauded Merrimentes. Thus

far every one will be glad to side with so distinguished a critic as Dyce; but when directly afterwards he ridicules Ritson for having inserted in the catalogue of Kemp's 'Works', the 'Applauded Merrimentes', nobody, it is true, will be ready to raise that fragment of buffoonery, — even supposing it to have been amplified by improvisation, — to the dignity of a 'Work', but nobody, on the other hand, I think, will be justified in denying, with Dyce, that Kemp was its author. On the contrary, this fact is supported by a testimony quoted by Dyce himself (XXV), viz. a passage in Nash's 'Strange Newes, Of the intercepting certaine Letters' (1592) where Nash advises Gabriel Harvey to be on his guard lest Will Kemp should choose him one of these days for the subject of one of his 'Merrimentes'.*

Beside the 'Applauded Merrimentes' three jigs are entered in the Stationers' Registers (1591 and 1595) as 'Kemp's Jig' or 'Kemp's New Jig'. According to Dyce these jigs were ascribed to Kemp on no other ground than because, by his consummate skill, he had succeeded in rendering them popular. His reasons for this assertion are twofold. First, he alleges that Kemp himself speaks of his *Nine Daies' Wonder* (1600) as the first pamphlet published by him, which, according to Dyce, would be an untruth if he had published not only the 'Applauded Merrimentes' but also three jigs before that time; for it would be a poor argument, Dyce adds, to distinguish between the jigs and the *Nine Daies' Wonder*, on the ground that the former were not pamphlets. I do not see why this argument is to be rejected as a poor one; jigs were a species of plays, and written in verse, as Dyce himself admits, whereas the *Nine Daies' Wonder* is written

* Mr Collier, H. E. Dr. P., III, 33, erroneously cites the passage in question as taken from Nash's *Apologie for Pierce Pennilesse* (1593).

in prose as other pamphlets are. Besides, are we quite sure that Kemp's jigs were given to the world by the author himself, as we know his *Nine Daies Wonder* was? May not their publication have been effected in the same manner in which so many Elizabethan plays were published, without the consent, nay, even without the knowledge of the authors? Granting this, it certainly would have been an unimpeachable statement, for Kemp to style the *Nine Daies Wonder* 'the first pamphlet that ever Will Kemp offred to the Presse'.

The second argument adduced by Dyce in support of his opinion cannot lay claim to any greater cogency. Although Kemp, he says, was not 'grossly illiterate', as is proved by his *Nine Daies Wonder*, yet he could not boast of a faculty for poetry; for, 'if he had been a practised jig-maker', he would not have needed the assistance of a friend for the few verses inserted in the *Nine Daies Wonder*. If, however, we peruse this pamphlet without prejudice we cannot doubt but that Kemp himself, and no other, was the author of the two little pieces on p. 10 and p. 13 seq.; the good fellow, his friend, to whom he ascribes them is nothing but a poetical fiction, a mask, which is common enough, the predecessor of the 'judicious friend' in Lord Macaulay's *Life and Letters*. Both in matter and style these verses entirely agree with Kemp's prose; in both we meet with the same kind of wit and buffoonery, both are clearly from the same pen.

But Dyce goes still farther. Not only the Merriments and the Jigs, but everything else that bears Kemp's name, with the sole exception of the *Nine Daies Wonder*, he declares to be spurious. This leads us back to the above-mentioned little volume '*A Dutiful Inuective &c.*' which was published in 1587 with William Kemp's name on the title-page. This poem, written in iambic lines of seven feet, is

termed 'the first fruites of his labour' by the author and inscribed to the Lord Mayor of London. It is directed against the traitors Ballard and Babington, and expresses an ardent enthusiasm for the Queen. In this latter respect it is quite of a piece with the *Nine Daies Wonder*, towards the end of which the author assures us that 'al his mirths (meane though they be) haue bin and euer shal be implo'd to the delight of my royal Mistris; whose sacred name ought not to be remembred among such ribald rimes as these late thin-breecht lying Ballet-singers haue proclaimed it.' This is the well-known language of all players and play-wrights of the time, who were abundantly thankful for the favour and patronage which the Queen extended to the stage. Although in 1587 Kemp had not yet succeeded to Tarlton, he may even at that time have attracted the notice of the Queen and received marks of her favour. In spite of all this Dyce does not hesitate to attribute the 'Dutiful Inuective' to another William Kemp, who, as Dyce informs us, was a schoolmaster at Plymouth, and who in the following year published a treatise under the title 'The Education of Children in Learning'. As, however, on the title-page of this latter tract we read only the initials W. K., there is nothing to assure us that they are meant for William Kemp. May they not stand just as well for Walter King, or Knight, or Kelly? But taking it for proven that there was a schoolmaster of the name of William Kemp living at Plymouth and that he was the author of the treatise in question, all that we may infer from this proposition is, that we have to deal with two William Kemps, the one living at London, the other at Plymouth; the one an actor, the other a schoolmaster; the one the author of the *Nine Daies Wonder*, the other the author of the *Education of Children in Learning*, and one of them the author of the

Dutiful Inuective. Now what reason have we to ascribe this latter production to the schoolmaster rather than to the actor? Is he to be thought endowed with a larger measure of the 'faculty divine' than his namesake the actor? And living at Plymouth, as he did, what reason had he to inscribe his treatise to the Lord Mayor of London? A London actor might well be induced to flatter His Lordship by the dedication of some document of dutiful loyalty and well-spent literary labour, as the grim City-potentate did not usually look with a benign eye on theatres and theatrical amusements, least of all jigs and clowns. Besides it should be remembered that when several years after Kemp danced his morris to Norwich, he began it before the Lord Mayor's house. And for what reason should the heart of the Plymouth schoolmaster have dilated with the same enthusiastic loyalty for the Queen, as did that of the London actor? That William Kemp, the actor, came before the public more than once in print is fairly to be inferred from the wellknown words which the student Philomusus addresses to him in *The Return from Parnassus* (1606): 'Indeed M. Kempe', he says, 'you are very famous, but that is as well for workes in print as your part in kue.' As we have seen, Dyce not only ridicules the expression 'workes' which may indeed be comically exaggerated, but he declares the whole statement to be incorrect and not deserving of belief; 'I understand', he says, 'the ironical compliment as an allusion to his (viz. Kemp's) *Nine Daies Wonder* only; for I feel assured that all the other pieces have been erroneously attributed to his pen.' This assertion, in my opinion, is by no means borne out by the facts and is wholly gratuitous.

In the same spirit of overstrained criticism Dyce discusses the journeys, which on the testimony of several contemporaries

were undertaken by Kemp; if we are to believe him, all of them, with the single exception of the morris to Norwich, are entirely fictitious. Now Kemp himself towards the end of the Nine Daies Wonder declares his intention of setting out on some journey; though not yet certain as to its aim, he mentions Rome, Jerusalem, and Venice as places where he should be most inclined to go. No account of such a journey is extant, and this fact is thought by Dyce a sufficient argument to deny its having been made at all. In the passage just quoted from *The Return from Parnassus*, however, Kemp is welcomed as having just come back from abroad and Philomusus and Studioso, the two Cambridge students, address him in the following words: — '*Phil.* What, M. Kempe, how doth the Emperour of Germany?' *Stud.* God save you, M. Kempe; welcome, M. Kempe, from dancing the morrice ouer the Alpes.' Kemp's reply is this: — 'Well, you merry knaues, you may come to the honour of it one day: is it not better to make a foole of the world as I have done, then to be fooled of the world as you schollers are?' All this Dyce declares to be nothing but 'sportive allusions to Kemp's journey to Norwich', an assertion which hardly needs refutation. In what connection do the Emperor of Germany and the Alps stand to Norwich, and how can a mention of the former be taken for an allusion to the latter? According to the simplest rules of interpretation the question 'How doth the Emperour of Germany?' suggests the fact that Kemp saw the Emperor, or at least heard of him from persons attached to his court or train, as well he might if he had been in Germany. But if Kemp travelled at all he certainly did so in his capacity as a clown and dancer and it was no doubt the aim of his journey to turn his histrionic talents to the best possible account. Why then may he not have

acted before his Imperial Majesty? We know that John Spencer, who was at the head of a company of English actors in the service of the Elector of Brandenburg, travelled with his company in the South of Germany and performed several times before the Emperor and the Diet at Ratisbon in 1613.* If Kemp really should have done so before his countryman, he may very likely on his return have boasted of the honour and this boasting may have occasioned the comic exaggerations and railleries with which his friends and contemporaries bantered him, — a supposition which *mutatis mutandis* may likewise hold in regard to Kemp's so-called 'Works'.

Our belief in Kemp's journey to Italy is greatly strengthened by two additional testimonies. In the above-mentioned dedication of the pamphlet 'An Almond for a Parrot' Nash tells us that about the year 1588 he was in Italy and that at Bergamo the Italian 'arlechini' inquired about the celebrated M. Kemp of whom they spoke in terms of highest eulogy. This, I think, could not but prove an inducement to Kemp to go to Italy himself and there to make the acquaintance of his Italian fellow-clowns and admirers. The international intercourse between England and Italy, especially Northern Italy, was highly flourishing and a journey to Italy was easily and cheaply to be accomplished, — according to the notions and customs of the time. Nevertheless, it must be owned that Nash's dedication is written in that style of buffoonery which seems to be inseparable from the dedicator and still more so from the dedicatee, and as we are not sure to what extent similar jokes may have been thought allowable in those merry days it may be as well not to lay too great a stress

* A. Cohn, Shakespeare in Germany LXXXIV seq.

on this dedication. It is different, however, with a second testimony, also quoted by Dyce himself, viz. a passage in John Day's 'Travailes of the three English Brothers' &c., an *historical* (!) play which was published in 1607, but, according to Dyce, written before that time, as it is not yet divided into acts and scenes. Here Will Kemp is introduced, *in propria persona*, in a scene laid at Venice. In this scene an Englishman desires to be presented to Sir Anthony Shirley who is staying at Venice as ambassador from the Sophy. 'An Englishman?' Sir Anthony asks his servant, 'what's his name?' *Serv.* He calls himselfe Kempe. *Sir Anth.* Kemp! bid him come in. [*Exit Servant. Enter Kempe.*] Welcome, honest Will; and how doth all thy fellowes in England?' &c. Then an Italian clown and his wife make their appearance and ask permission to perform before Sir Anthony, who prevails upon Kemp to join in this performance of the two Italians. Kemp, however, takes great offence at a woman exhibiting before spectators, and therefore makes her and her husband the butt of his jokes and satirical remarks. Now this scene in my opinion would have been meaningless, and insipid, and hardly tolerable on a London stage, if Kemp had not been really at Venice and had not been a partaker there in some such exhibition. For this same reason we must conclude that 'The Travailes of the three English Brothers' was acted during Kemp's lifetime.

The date of Kemp's death is quite uncertain, the respective conjectures of Malone and Chalmers not being supported by positive evidence; according to Malone he died before 1609, according to Chalmers as early as 1603. That he was dead in 1612, is generally inferred from the passage in Heywood's Apologie quoted above, although Heywood's words are by no means explicit enough to remove all doubts. If we follow

Malone, who is generally a safe guide, Kemp may very well have witnessed the performance of the 'Travailes' and it is evident, provided he did not perform the part himself, that the zest of the joke for the audience must have been in seeing the real Kemp sitting amongst them opposite his counterfeit on the boards.

LXXXIV.

Tim. Thy backe, I prythee.

Ape. Liue, and loue thy misery.

Tim. Long liue so, and so dye. I am quit.

Ape. No things like men,

Eate Timon, and abhorre then. [*Exit Apemantus.*]

TIMON OF ATHENS, IV, 3, 396 SEQQ.

This is the arrangement of the folio. The last two lines have rightly been given to Timon by the editors and in order to complete the metre Hanmer and Capell have added *so* before the words *I am quit*. In my opinion, however, this is not sufficient to restore the passage; the words *Long live so, and so die* do not belong to Timon, but to Apemantus and the true arrangement, therefore, seems to be the following: —

Tim. Thy back, I prythee.

Ape. Live and love thy misery;

Long live so and so die. [*Exit Apemantus.*]

Tim. So I am quit. —

More things like men? — Eat, Timon, and abhor them.
(Shakespeare's dramatische Werke nach der Uebersetzung von Schlegel und Tieck, herausgegeben durch die Deutsche Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, X, 439. — Notes and Queries, June 25, 1870, p. 594.)

LXXXV.

Your greatest want is, you want much of meat.

TIMON OF ATHENS, IV, 3, 419.

Various conjectures have been proposed to cure this corrupted verse, none of which, however, proves satisfactory. Dyce, and the Cambridge Editors, therefore, have left the reading of the folio untouched as above. The word *much* is evidently owing to a diplography: the Banditti having just complained that they *much do want*. Steevens conjectures *much of me*, which would be most bald and trivial prose; he should have altered one more letter, for there seems to be little doubt that Shakespeare wrote *you want muck of me*, viz. gold, in which sense this word is frequently used. Compare the Ballad of Gernutus, the Jew of Venice, St. 6 (Percy's Reliques): —

His heart doth thinke on many a wile,

How to deceive the poore;

His mouth is almost ful of mucke,

Yet still he gapes for more.

Coriolanus II, 2, 128 seqq.: —

Our spoils he kick'd at,

And look'd upon things precious as they were

The common muck of the world.

Thomas Heywood, If you know not me, you know nobody, Pt. II (ed. Collier for the Shakespeare-Society, 149): 'But, madam, you are rich, and by my troth, I am very poor, and I have been, as a man should say, stark naught; — — and, though I have not the muck of the world, I have a great deal of good love, and I pritheee accept of it.' — Nash, Summer's Last Will and Testament (Dodsley, 1825, IX, 23): 'If then the best husband has been so liberal of his best

handy-work, to what end should we make much of a glittering *excrement*. or doubt to spend at a banquet as many pounds, as he spends men at a battle?' — Ibid. IX, 25: '*Omnia mea mecum porto*, quoth Bias, when he had nothing but bread and cheese in a leathern bag, and two or three books in his bosom. Saint Francis, a holy saint, and never had any money. It is madness to doat upon mucke.' — 'Tell-Trothes New-yeares Gift (ed. Furnivall for the New Shakspeare Society, 69): 'Many looke so long for abundance of mucke, as they fall into a quagmire of miseries, hauing siluer to looke on, though wanting mony to supply many wants.' — Ibid. 75: 'Indeede, what cannot money doo, that will buye any thing? and yet honestie will purchase that which all the muck in the world cannot compasse, namely, a good report for euer.' — Forby, Vocabulary of East-Anglia s. v. Muckgrubber, 'a hunks; a sordid saver of money, who delves for it, as it were, in the mire.' 'Muckgrubbing, adj. sordidly avaricious.'

To revert to the passage in Timon. To the pretence of the bandits that they are no thieves, 'but men that much do want', Timon replies they could not possibly be in want, since nature, the bounteous housewife, on each bush laid her full mess before them; their only want was for muck, i. e. gold, and that was no real want. The same reproach is addressed by Timon to the painter and the poet (V, 1, 115):

Hence, pack! Here's gold; you came for gold, ye slaves.
(Shakespeare's dramatische Werke nach der Uebersetzung von Schlegel und Tieck, herausgegeben von der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, X, 439. — Notes and Queries, June 25, 1870, 594. Compare the ever-memorable reply by A. H[all], Notes and Queries, July 16, 1870, 43.)

LXXXVI.

Cæs. Ha! who calls?

Casca. Bid every noise be still: peace yet again!

Cæs. Who is it in the press that calls on me?

JULIUS CÆSAR, I, 2, 13 SEQQ.

According to the Cambridge Edition ad loc. Staunton seems to have been the only editor who takes exception to these lines as transmitted by the folio. In his opinion either the whole of the second line ought to be added to Cæsar's previous question *Who calls?* or the last word of it should be connected with the following speech of Cæsar, thus: —

Cæs. Ha! who calls?

Casca. Bid every noise be still: — peace yet!

Cæs. Again!

Who is it in the press that calls on me?

This is even worse than the arrangement of the folio, and yet the true reading lies so near at hand that it will seem almost miraculous if I have not been forestalled in finding it out. Read, of course: —

Cæs. Ha! who calls? — [*To Casca*] Bid every noise

Casca. Peace yet again! [be still!]

Cæs. Who is it in the press that calls on me?

Once before, at the beginning of the scene, where Cæsar addresses Calpurnia, Casca with marked officiousness silenced the crowd: —

Cæs. Calpurnia!

Casca. Peace ho! Cæsar speaks.

Nothing, therefore, can be more simple and natural than that Cæsar once more summons the assistance of Casca and that Casca again proclaims silence. (Anglia, herausgegeben von Wülcker und Trautmann, I, 341.)

LXXXVII.

Cassi. Am I not stay'd for? tell me:

Cinna. Yes, you are. O Cassius,
If you could but winne the Noble Brutus
To our party —

JULIUS CÆSAR, I, 3, 139 SEQQ.

The arrangement of these lines as given in the folio cannot possibly have proceeded from the poet's pen, and the editors, therefore, have made various attempts to heal the evident corruption. Capell, e. g., reads: —

Yes,

You are. O Cassius, if you could but win
The noble Brutus to our party.

The words *Yes, you are*, however, should not be severed, and must no doubt be connected with the preceding speech of Cassius in a line of verse. S. Walker (*Versification*, 290), Craik (*The English of Shakespeare*, 5th Ed., 120), and Staunton arrange as follows: —

Cassi. Am I not staid for? Tell me!
*Cinna.** Yes, you are.
O Cassius, if you could
But win the noble Brutus to our party.

But the incomplete line *O Cassius, if you could* does not harmonize with the metrical character of this play, which, it is well known, is of great regularity. Knight and Collier introduce an alexandrine: —

Yes, you are.

O Cassius, if you could but win the noble Brutus
To our party.

* Instead of *Cinna* Walker by an evident mistake has *Casca*.

In my opinion the difficulty might easily be removed, if we were to add *Caius* before *Cassius*, — he is elsewhere addressed by both his names, just as we find Caius Ligarius (in Julius Cæsar), Caius Marcius (in Coriolanus) and Caius Lucius (in Cymbeline). The lines then might be regulated thus: —

Cas. Am I not staid for? Tell me!

Cin. Yes, you are.

O Caius Cassius, if you could but win

The noble Brutus to our party.

Whether or not, we suppose the sentence to be broken off here, does not matter, at least it does not affect the alteration proposed. (Anglia, herausgegeben von Wülcker und Trautmann, I, 341 folg.)

LXXXVIII.

And then, they say, no spirit dare stir abroad;
The nights are wholesome; then no planets strike,
No fairy takes, nor witch hath power to charm,
So hallow'd and so gracious is the time.

HAMLET, I, I, 161 SEQQ.

I hope I may be allowed to repeat a conjectural emendation which, although inserted in the text of my edition of Hamlet, has been left unnoticed by all subsequent editors — even by Dr Furness. The plural ‘planets’, which is the uniform reading of QB seqq. and all the Folios, does not harmonize well with the singulars ‘fairy’ and ‘witch’. Moreover, in all parallel passages we meet with the singular, thus, e. g., in The Winter’s Tale, I, 2, 201: —

It is a bawdy planet, that will strike
Where ’t is predominant.

Ibid. II, 1, 105: —

There's some ill planet reigns.

Titus Andronicus, II, 4, 14: —

If I do wake, some planet strike me down;

Ben Jonson, Every Man in his Humour, IV, 5: Sure I was struck with a planet thence, for I had no power to touch my weapon.

Under these circumstances I have no doubt that the text of QA 'no planet frikes' shows us the right way and that we should read, — *no planet strikes*.

LXXXIX.

Hor. Indeed? I heard it not; it then draws near
the season

Wherein the spirit held his wont to walk.

HAMLET, I, 4, 5 SEQ.

Seymour (apud Furness) remarks on this verse: 'This line is overloaded. "I heard it not" is implied in "indeed". Read: Indeed? why then it does draw near the hour!' — It need hardly be added that a conjecture of such unwarranted violence is not in accordance with the rules of modern criticism and cannot but be rejected. Nevertheless Seymour seems to have been on the right scent, for a verse of six feet looks suspicious and out of place here. This was evidently felt also by Rowe, who (according to the Cambridge Edition) expunged *Indeed*. In my opinion, the word *Indeed* does not belong to Horatio, but should be given to Hamlet, so that the passage would run thus: —

Ham. The air bites shrewdly; it is very cold.

Hor. It is a nipping and an eager air.

Ham. What hour now?

Hor. I think it lacks of twelve.

Mar. No, it is struck.

Ham. Indeed?

Hor. I heard it not; it then draws near the season
Wherein the spirit held his wont to walk.

Only on the stage the import of this arrangement can be fully shown. Hamlet has evidently followed Horatio and Marcellus to the platform in a state of dreaminess; his question *What hour now?* is uttered rather listlessly and with no deeper motive than to break the silence. On hearing, however, from Marcellus that it has just struck midnight, he is at once roused to the most anxious expectation as now or never the appearance of the Ghost must be at hand. To this expectation he gives expression by the exclamation *Indeed?* — By the way, it may be added that the Editors of the Globe Edition, and Mr Moberly in their wake, give the words *No, it is struck*, in opposition to the Quartos as well as Folios, to Hamlet; on what grounds, it does not appear — at all events they ought to have been ‘more relative’. Most likely it is only a mistake, the Cambridge Edition being in accordance with the old copies. (The Athenæum, Jan. 11, 1879, 40 seq. — Robinson’s Epitome of Literature, Mar. 15, 1879, Vol. III, 48.)

XC.

The dram of eale
Doth all the noble substance of a doubt
To his owne scandle.

HAMLET, I, 4, 36 SEQQ.

Among the numerous emendations of this notoriously corrupt passage that which Dyce has inserted in his text ('the dram of evil Doth all the noble substance *oft debase*') deserves the highest praise for its clear and unconstrained sense. It is, however, so remote from the reading of the old editions that, if it was what Shakespeare wrote, we can hardly conceive how such a corruption could have crept into the text. I think we might obtain a very near approach to the text, together with an unexceptionable sense, by reading: —

The dram of evil
Doth all the noble substance *often daub*
To his own scandal.

Compare Romeo and Juliet, III, 2, 55 seq.: —

Pale, pale as ashes, all bedaub'd in blood,
All in gore-blood; I swounded at the sight.

B. Jonson, Every Man out of his Humour (Induction): —

My soul
Was never ground into such oily colours
To flatter vice, and daub iniquity.

Beaumont and Fletcher, The Knight of the Burning Pestle, V, 3: —

I shall never more
Hold open, whilst another pumps both legs,
Nor daub a sattin gown with rotten eggs.

A Warning for Fair Women, A. II, ll. 1448 seqq. (Simpson, The School of Shakspeare, II, 325): —

Vile world, how like a monster come I soil'd from thee!
How have I wallowed in thy loathsome filth,
Drunk and besmear'd with all thy bestial sin.

Satires. By Joseph Hall, afterwards Bishop of Exeter and Norwich &c. (Chiswick, 1824) Book IV, Sat. I, p. 78: —

The close adultress, where her name is red,
 Comes crawling from her husband's lukewarm bed,
 Her carrion skin bedaub'd with odours sweet
 Groping the postern with her bared feet. — —
 She seeks her third roost on her silent toes,
 Besmeared all with loathsome smoke of lust,
 Like Acheron's steams, or smouldering sulphur dust.

Milton, *Comus*, 916 seqq.: —

Next this marble venom'd seat,
 Smeared with gums of glutinous heat,
 I touch with chaste palms moist and cold.

In regard to the sentiment expressed in Hamlet's words compare Nash, *Pierce Pennilesse* (ed. Collier for the Shakespeare Society, 53), a passage, which, as far as I know, has never yet been brought into comparison with the lines in Hamlet: 'Let him bee indued with neuer so manie vertues, and haue as much goodly proportion and fauour, as Nature can bestow vpon a man, yet if hee be thirstie after his owne destruction, and hath no ioy nor comfort, but when he is drowning his soule in a gallon pot, that one beastly imperfection wil vtterly obscure all that is commendable in him, and all his goode qualities sinke like lead downe to the bottome of his carrowing cups, where they will lye, like lees and dregges, dead and vnregarded of any man.' — *Pierce Pennilesse*, to add this as a matter worthy of further consideration, was published in 1592, whilst the above Shakespearean passage does not appear in the quarto of 1603, but is only found in that of 1604. —

Eleven years after the first publication of this conjectural emendation (*The Athenæum*, Aug. 11, 1866, 186) Mr Samuel Neil, in his edition of Hamlet, apparently without any knowledge of my suggestion, proposed the following: —

This dram of *talc*

Doth all the noble substance *overdaube*,

To *its* own scandal.

Talc, which, Mr Neil says, 'was a wonderful cosmetic and preservative of the complexion, much in use in Shakespeare's time', would be just the reverse of what is required by the context. Some Elizabethan authority for the verb *overdaub* would have been welcome.

XCI.

You know, sometimes he walks four hours together,
Here in the lobby.

HAMLET, II, 2, 160 SEQ.

Dr Jacob Heussi in his edition of this tragedy (Parchim, 1868) has inserted Hanmer's conjecture 'for' into the text and justifies this reading by the following note: 'Alle alten Drucke lesen freilich *four* statt *for*, und die Erklärer behaupten, *four* werde häufig als unbestimmte Zeit gebraucht, wie *forty*; nirgends findet sich aber diese Behauptung durch ein wirkliches Beispiel constatirt; dass *four* heut zu Tage nicht in dieser Weise gebraucht wird, ist bekannt, ob es früher der Fall war, ist noch abzuwarten. Ich setze hier die Präposition *for* statt des *four* der Ausgaben, da diese Präposition die Zeitdauer bezeichnet.* Benno Tschischwitz (Shakspere's Hamlet &c. Halle, 1869) reads *four*, but seems to take this number in its literal meaning. '*Four hours*', he says, 'wäre eine auffallend lange Zeit, um sich zu ergehen, wenn sie nicht der

* The latest American editor of Shakespeare's Tragedy of Hamlet, the Rev. Henry N. Hudson, also reads 'for', and does not even think it necessary to justify it.

Prinz, der gänzlich ohne die noblen Passionen eines Laertes ist, mit Lectüre und Meditationen ausfüllte. Auch Ophelia wird später aufgefordert 'to walk' und dabei in einem Buche zu lesen, es mag dies also wohl einer Zeitsitte entsprechen.' Mr Collier's corrected Folio exhibits the correction *for* and even Malone preferred this oft-repeated conjectural emendation to the reading of the old editions, although he adduces the following passage from Webster's Duchess of Malfi (IV, 1, 10 seq.), which is so much to the point that it ought to have removed every doubt: —

She will muse four hours together; and her silence,
Methinks, expresseth more than if she spake.

Malone (Supplement I, 352) goes so far as to suppose the same mistake to have taken place here as well as in Hamlet and Mr Collier in his Supplemental Notes I, 276 expresses the same conviction; 'the same probable misprint', he says, 'of *four* for *for* is contained in Webster's Duchess of Malfi A. IV (ed. Dyce I, 260), where Bosola is giving to Ferdinand a description of the demeanour of the heroine' &c.

The fact is that *four*, as well as *forty* and *forty thousand*, is most frequently used to denote an indefinite number and this use, dating from a very remote period, is by no means confined to the English language, but is also to be found in other languages. As an indefinite number generally supposes a large quantity it will not appear strange that *four* occurs much less frequently in this sense than *forty*; the instances, however, are numerous enough to convince even Dr Heussi.

After the remarks made by J. Grimm (Deutsche Rechtsalterthümer, 211, seqq.) on the number 'four' there can be little doubt as to its early connection with the four cardinal points and their influence on the construction of roads, the

distribution of land and other matters of custom.* But in German, as well as in English, all local and legal associations connected with this number have long ago vanished, and when in the Lay of the Nibelungen (Lachmann, 2014; Zarncke, 4th Ed., p. 318) we read: —

tûsent unde viere, die kômen dar in,

‘tûsent’ merely means an indefinite quantity and ‘viere’ a surplus likewise indefinite. In Ayrrer’s dramas (ed. Keller, IV, 2796 and 2801) occur the following passages: —

Er wûrd wol vier mahl vmb gebracht,

Eh er ein mal drob thet erwachen,

and: —

Ach Ancilla, ich bitt durch Gott

Verlass mich nicht in dieser Noth!

Vier Cronen geb’ ich dir zu Lohn.

The earliest instance in English I have met with is in Robert Mannyng’s translation of Peter Langtoft’s Chronicle (apud Wûlcker, Altenglisches Lesebuch I, 64 and 153): —

Sone in for yers perchance a werre shall rise.

Very near to the passage in Hamlet comes the following from Puttenham’s Arte of English Poesie (ed. Arber, 307): ‘laughing and gibing with their familiars foure houres by the clocke.’ Other instances, no less striking, are supplied by the Elizabethan dramatists, Shakespeare amongst the number. In the Old Play of Timon (ed. Dyce p. 7) we read: —

Timon, lend me a little goulden dust,

To ffree me from this ffeind; some fower talents

Will doe it.

* With the Hawaiians, according to Pott (Die quinare und vigesimale Zählmethode, Halle, 1847, S. 74 seq.) four is the primary number and is possibly taken from the four extremities of the human body.

S. Rowley, When you see me, you know me (ed. Elze, 22): 'The lords has attended here this four days.' — Lilly's *Endimion*, IV, 2. (Dramatic Works, ed. F. W. Fairholt, I, 53): '*Sam.* But how wilt thou live? *Epi.* By angling; O 'tis a stately occupation to stand foure houres in a colde morning, and to have his nose bitten with frost before his baite be mumbled with a fish.' — Lord Cromwell, II, 2 (Malone's Supplement, II, 391): 'We were scarce four miles in the green water, but I, thinking to go to my afternoon's nuncheon, felt a kind of rising in my guts.' — Webster, *The White Devil*, or *Vittoria Corombona* (The Works of John Webster, ed. Dyce, 1857, 47a): —

I made a vow to my deceased lord,
Neither yourself nor I should outlive him
The numbering of four hours.

Ibid. (ed. Dyce, 49b): —

O could I kill you forty times a day,
And use 't four years together, 'twere too little.

Fair Em (ed. Delius, 17): —

I have not seen him this four days at the least.
The Winter's Tale, V, 2, 146 seqq.: '*Autolycus.* I know you are now, sir, a gentleman born. *Clown.* Ay, and have been so any time these four hours.' — *K. Henry V*, V, 1, 42 seq.: 'I say, I will make him eat some part of my leek, or I will peat his pate four days.'

These passages, I think, are amply sufficient for the vindication of the reading *four hours*, but in order fully to illustrate the subject the numbers *forty* and *forty thousand* must also be taken into consideration. As early as in the Old Testament 'forty' is used in an indefinite sense; the Deluge lasts forty days and forty nights; Moses with the Jews lives forty years in the wilderness (Acts, XIII, 18) and stays forty

days and forty nights on Mount Sinai (Exodus, XXIV, 18). According to the Book of Judges (III, 11; V, 31; VIII, 28) the land had repeatedly rest for forty years and the children of Israel were delivered into the hands of the Philistines for forty years (Judges, XIII, 1).^{*} Jesus fasted forty days and forty nights in the wilderness (Matth., IV, 2). The same use prevails in the popular poetry both of Germany and England. Thus in the ballad *Das Schloss in Oesterreich* (apud Scherer, *Jungbrunnen*, 3^d Ed., 67) we read: —

Darinnen liegt ein junger Knab
Auf seinen Hals gefangen,
Wol vierzig Klafter tief unter der Erd'
Bei Ottern und bei Schlangen.

Jacob Ayrer (*Dramatic Works*, ed. Keller, V, 3213) says: —

Starb doch der gross Riess Goliat,
Der deiner sterckh wol firtzigk hat.

In the English romance of Richard Cœur-de-Lion Richard winds forty yards of silk cloth round his arm before putting it into the lion's mouth and tearing out his heart; compare Percy's *Reliques*, *Essay on the Ancient Metrical Romances*.

Instances of the use of 'forty' in Elizabethan dramatists are exceedingly frequent. Webster, *The White Devil*, or *Vittoria Corombona* (*Works*, ed. Dyce 26 b): —

Wilt sell me forty ounces of her blood
To water a mandrake?

Heywood, *If you know not me, you know nobody* (ed. Collier, 71; cf. *ibid.* 125): —

^{*} Also the numbers *four*, *twenty* (the half of forty), *twenty two thousand*, *forty thousand*, and *four hundred thousand* seem to have been used in an indefinite sense in the Old Testament as well as in the Elizabethan dramatists; cf. Judges XI, 40. XIX, 2. IV, 3. XX, 21. XV, 20. XVI, 31. V, 8. XX, 2. XX, 17.

Bid him by that token
Sort thee out forty pounds' worth of such wares
As thou shalt think most beneficial.

Ben Jonson, *The Devil is an Ass*, II, 8: —

O, sir! and dresses himself the best! beyond
Forty o' your ladies! Did you ne'er see him?

B. Jonson, *Epicoene*, IV, 1: I have not kissed my Fury these forty weeks. — *Ibid.*: A most vile face! And yet she spends me forty pound a year in mercury and hogsbones. — *Bartholomew Fair*, II, 1: Like enough, sir; she'll do forty such things in an hour (an you listen to her) for her recreation. — *Ibid.* III, 1: Put him a-top o' the table, where his place is, and he'll do you forty fine things. — Marlowe, *The Jew of Malta*, IV, 4 (ed. Dyce, 168b): Within forty foot of the gallows, conning his neckverse. — Beaumont and Fletcher, *The Knight of Malta*, III, 4: —

Oh, 't was royal music!

And to procure a sound sleep for a soldier,
Worth forty of your fiddles.

Twelfth Night, V, 1, 180 seq.: I had rather than forty pound I were at home. — *A Midsummer-Night's Dream*, II, 1, 175 seq.: —

I'll put a girdle round about the earth
In forty minutes.

The Merry Wives of Windsor, I, 1, 205: I had rather than forty shillings, I had my book of songs and sonnets here. — *The Comedy of Errors*, IV, 3, 84: —

A ring he hath of mine worth forty ducats —
For forty ducats is too much to lose.

Henry VIII, V, 4, 53 seq.: When I might see from far some forty truncheoners draw to her succour,

Even now-a-days this use of 'forty' is by no means extinct. In Wordsworth's little poem 'Written in March' (Poetical Works, Moxon, 1850, 6 vols, II, 110) we read: —

The cattle are grazing,
Their heads never raising;
There are forty feeding like one.

The well-known ballad 'Barbara Frietchie' by Mr J. G. Whittier (Complete Poetical Works, Boston, 1879, 270) contains the following lines: —

Forty flags with their silver stars,
Forty flags with their crimson bars,

Flapped in the morning wind: the sun
Of noon looked down, and saw not one.

'Forty thousand' occurs in 1 Tamburlaine, II, 1 (ed. Dyce, 13b): —

Our army will be forty thousand strong.

Edward III, IV, 6 (ed. Delius 78): —

No less than forty thousand wicked elders
Have forty lean slaves this day ston'd to death.

Webster, The White Devil, or Vittoria Corombona (Works, ed. Dyce, 25a): I'd — — be entered into the list of the forty thousand pedlers in Poland. — The Winter's Tale, IV, 4, 279 seqq.: Here's another ballad of a fish, that appeared upon the coast on Wednesday the fourscore of April, forty thousand fathom above water and sung this ballad against the hard hearts of maids.

In Lagamon, 25, 395 we have 'feouwer hundred thusende'.

It is a noteworthy fact that the halves also of these numbers, from 'two' upwards, are used in the same indefinite sense. K. Lear, I, 2, 169 seq.: *Edm.* Spake you with him?

Edg. Ay, two hours together. — The Old Play of Timon (ed. Dyce, 73): —

Gelas. Pseudocheus,

How many miles think you that wee must goe?

Pseud. Two thousande, forty four.

Hamlet, IV, 4, 25: —

Two thousand souls, and twenty thousand ducats.*

No-body and Some-body l. 1276 seqq. (Simpson, The School of Shakspeare I, 327): —

Two thousand Souldiers have I brought from Wales,
To wait upon the princely Periclure.

Malg. As many of my bold confederates
Have I drawn from the South, to sweare allegiance
To young Vigenius.

The use of 'twenty', as is to be expected, far exceeds that of 'two' in frequency. The Merchant of Venice, II, 6, 66: —

I have sent twenty out to seek for you.

Ibid. III, 4, 74: —

And twenty of these puny lies I'll tell.

Ibid. III, 4, 84: —

For we must measure twenty miles to-day,
where, however, 'twenty' may possibly have been used in its literal sense; see my Abhandlungen zu Shakespeare, 304. —
The Tempest, II, 1, 278 seqq.: —

twenty consciences

That stand 'twixt me and Milan, candied be they
And melt ere they molest.

The Taming of the Shrew, Ind. II, 37 seq.: —

* S. Walker (Crit. Exam. III, 268) feels convinced, that an indefinite number is required here, but, not being aware of the true nature of 'two thousand', needlessly conjectures 'Ten thousand'.

Apollo plays

And twenty caged nightingales do sing.

Richard II, II, 2, 14: —

Each substance of a grief hath twenty shadows.

Heywood, If you know not me, you know nobody (ed. Collier, 125): —

Thou owest me but twenty pound

I'll venture forty more.

Ibid. ed. Collier, 150: —

Now, for your pains, there is twenty pound in gold.

The Return from Parnassus, III, 2 (Hawkins, Origin of the English Drama, III, 242): When he returns, I'll tell twenty admirable lies of his hawk. — Ibid. (Hawkins, III, 249): —

His hungry sire will scrape you twenty legs

From one good Christmas meal on Christmas-day, &c.

S. Rowley, When you see me, you know me (ed. Elze, 36): King Harry loves a man and I perceive there's some mettle in thee, there's twenty angels for thee.* — In Chapman's Alphonsus (ed. Elze, 49) a poison is extolled because: —

it is twenty hours before it works,

whilst in Marlowe's Jew of Malta, III (ed. Dyce, 163b) it is said of another poison that even forty hours must elapse before its effect be perceived: —

It is a precious powder that I bought

Of an Italian, in Ancona, once,

Whose operation is to bind, infect,

And poison deeply, yet not appear

In forty hours after it is ta'en.

* A few lines before the King gives one of the Prisoners 'forty angels', to 'drink to king Harry's health'.

A Warning for Fair Women, A. II, l. 820 seq. (Simpson, *The School of Shakspeare*, II, 300): —

Roger, canst thou get but twenty pound,
Of all the plate that thou hadst from us both.

Ibid. A. II, l. 1062 seqq. (Simpson, II, 310): —

I have heard it told, that digging up a grave
Wherein a man had twenty years been buried, &c.

‘Twenty-thousand’ occurs hardly less frequently than
‘twenty’. The *Two Gentleman of Verona*, II, 6, 16: —

With twenty thousand soul-confirming oaths.

The *Merry Wives of Windsor*, IV, 4, 90: —

Though twenty thousand worthier come to crave her.

Love’s Labour’s Lost, V, 2, 37: —

I am compared to twenty thousand fairs.

The *Taming of the Shrew*, II, 1, 123 and V, 2, 113: twenty
thousand crowns. K. Richard II, IV, 1, 59: —

To answer twenty thousand such as you.

2 K. Henry VI, III, 2, 141 seq.: —

Fain would I go to chafe his paly lips
With twenty thousand kisses.

Ibid. III, 2, 206: —

Though Suffolk dare him twenty thousand times.

Coriolanus, III, 3, 70: —

Within thine eyes sat twenty thousand deaths.

Hamlet, IV, 4, 60: —

The imminent death of twenty thousand men.

In Dryden’s alteration of the *Tempest*, IV, 1, we meet with
‘twenty hundred’: —

You cannot tell me, sir,
I know I’m made for twenty hundred women
(I mean if there so many be i’ th’ world), &c.

The very acme of indefinite numbers is reached, curiously enough, by a rather sedate and cool-headed character, viz. Friar Laurence in *Romeo and Juliet*, III, 3, 153: —

and call thee back

With twenty hundred thousand times more joy

Then thou went'st forth in lamentation.

Also 'four and twenty' and 'two and twenty' may be mentioned as indefinite numbers; the former occurs in *The Winter's Tale*, IV, 3, 43: She hath made me four and twenty nosegays for the shearers; and in 1 *K. Henry IV*, III, 3, 85: and money lent you, four and twenty pound. 'Two and twenty' is found in 1 *K. Henry IV*, I, 1, 68 seqq.: —

Ten thousand bold Scots, two and twenty knights,

Balk'd in their own blood did Sir Walter see

On Holmedon's plain.

Ibid. II, 2, 16 seq.: I have forsworn his company hourly any time this two and twenty years, and yet I am bewitched with the rogue's company. — *Ibid.* III, 3, 211: O for a fine thief, of the age of two and twenty or thereabouts.

Even 'eighty' (= twice forty) occurs in an indefinite sense; see Hawkins, *The Origin of the English Drama* (Oxford, 1773) III, 233: Hark thou sir; you shall have eighty thanks.

I am of course far from asserting that no other numbers but those here discussed are used to denote an indefinite quantity; on the contrary several others such as 'three', 'seven', 'three and twenty' (*Troilus and Cressida*, I, 2, 255), 'three and twenty thousand' (1 *K. Henry VI*, I, 1, 113), 'five and twenty', 'five and twenty thousand' (3 *K. Henry VI*, II, 1, 181), are used more or less frequently in the same manner. (Shakespeare-Jahrbuch XI, 288 folg.)

XCII.

When we have shuffled off this mortal coil.

HAMLET, III, I, 67.

A non-English critic may well pause before questioning an expression which for a couple of centuries has been, as it were, a household word with all English-speaking people. I am, however, unable to silence the critical doubts to which the expression 'mortal coil' has given rise in me and which are greatly increased by the disagreement that prevails even among English editors about it. Warburton takes 'coil' in the sense of 'turmoil, bustle', and Al. Schmidt (*Shakespeare-Lexicon*, s.v.) likewise defines it by 'this turmoil of mortality, of life'; Heath thinks 'mortal coil' means the 'incumbrance of this mortal body'; and Caldecott does not hesitate to claim two (or three) meanings at one and the same time for the word, viz. that of 'turmoil' and that of 'ringlet' or 'slough'. 'It is here used,' he says, 'in each of its senses: turmoil, or bustle, and that which entwines or wraps round. Snakes generally lie like the coils of ropes; and it is conceived that an allusion is here had to the struggle which that animal is obliged to make in casting his slough.' — This explanation, though backed by no less an authority than Dr Furness, in my opinion can hardly be maintained, since the meaning of the word 'coil' with Elizabethan writers can be shown to have been quite definite and unequivocal. Other critics think 'coil' in our passage to be equivalent to what Fletcher (*Bonduca*, IV, 1) calls the 'case of flesh'. 'It has been contended,' says Dr Ingleby (*Shakespeare Hermeneutics*, 88) 'that in Hamlet's speech, the "mortal coil" is the coil, i. e. the trouble or turmoil, incident to man's mortal state: but the analogies are too strong in favour of the "mortal coil"

being what Fletcher calls the "case of flesh". — It is greatly to be regretted that Dr Ingleby has not favoured his readers with some one or other of these strong analogies. In the same, or at least in a similar, sense the word seems to have been taken by R. Chambers in his *Traditions of Edinburgh*, 198 seq.: 'Or does the "mortal coil" in which the light of mind is enveloped, become thinner or more transparent by the wearing of deadly sickness?' The explanation of the passage given by James Henry Hackett (*Notes and Comments upon Certain Plays and Actors of Shakespeare*, New York, 1864, 21 and 25) comes nearly to the same. This supposed signification of the word, however, is not supported by testimony; it is rather a signification 'for the nonce', a *petitio principii*. Still less acceptable seems that which a late English friend of mine imagined to be the meaning of 'coil' in the present passage; he understood it to denote a slough. But 'coil' nowhere occurs in this sense, and if it did, this sense would not fit the present passage, inasmuch as the poet does by no means speak of our mortal coil as of something which like a slough has already been cast off, but as of something which we are still wearing.

Apart from the line under discussion, the word 'coil' occurs eleven times in Shakespeare and in all these passages has the signification of 'turmoil, bustle, noise, disturbance'. To examine these instances which are enumerated both in Mrs Cowden Clarke's *Concordance* and in Al. Schmidt's *Shakespeare-Lexicon* would be labour thrown away, especially since all editors agree with respect to their interpretation. As may be expected, the word is no less frequent with other dramatists and writers of the Elizabethan era, and in order to get firm ground for our further inquiry it may, perhaps, be as well first to give a list of all those various

passages which in the course of many years' reading I have been able to collect.

1. Marlowe, 2 Tamburlaine, IV, 1 (ed. Dyce, 61b): —

Cal. I would my father would let me be put in the front of such a battle once, to try my valour! [*Alarms within.*] What a coil they keep! I believe there will be some hurt done anon amongst them.

2. Marlowe, Faustus, V, 1 (ed. Dyce, 129a; ed. W. Wagner, 94): —

Duke. What rude disturbers have we at the gate?

Go, pacify their fury, set it ope,

And then demand of them what they would have.

[*They knock again, and call out to talk with*

Faustus.

Serv. Why, how now, masters! what a coil is there!

What is the reason you disturb the Duke?

3. Marlowe, The Tragedy of Dido, A. IV init. (ed. Dyce, 265a): —

I think it was the devil's revelling night,

There was such hurly-burly in the heavens:

Doubtless Apollo's axle-tree is crack'd,

Or agèd Atlas' shoulder out of joint,

The motion was so over-violent.

Iar. In all this coil, where have ye left the queen?

4. Marlowe, Hero and Leander, Sixth Sestiad (ed. Dyce, 307a): —

As when you descry

A ship, with all her sail contends to fly

Out of the narrow Thames with winds unapt,

Now crosseth here, then there, then this way rapt,

And then hath one point reach'd, then alters all,

And to another crookèd reach doth fall

Of half a bird-bolt's shoot, keeping more coil
Than if she danc'd upon the ocean's toil.

5. Ben Jonson, *Cynthia's Revels*, IV, 1: —

Heart of my body, here's a coil, indeed, with your jealous humours.

6. Ben Jonson, *Bartholomew Fair*, I, 1: —

Do you hear! Jack Littlewit, what business does thy pretty head think this fellow may have, that he keeps such a coil with?

7. *Ibid.*, I, 1: —

And then he is such a ravener after fruit! — you will not believe what a coil I had t' other day to compound a business between Cather'ne pear woman and him, about snatching: 't is intolerable, gentlemen!

8. Ben Jonson, *Volpone*, II, 1 (Nano sings): —

You that would last long, list to my song,
Make no more coil, but buy of this oil.

9. Edward III, IV, 6 (ed. Delius, 76): —

What need we fight, and sweat, and keep a coil,
When railing crows outscold our adversaries.

10. *The Spanish Tragedy*, A. III (Qu. 1618, 32a): —

How now, what noise? What coyle is that you keepe?

[*A noyse within.*]

11. Lord Cromwell, I, 1 (Malone's Supplement, II, 374): —

He keeps such a coil in his study, with the sun, and the moon, and the seven stars, that I do verily think he'll read out his wits.

12. Middleton, *The Mayor of Quinborough*, III, 3 (Dodsley, 1780, XI, 127): —

Here's no sweet coil, I am glad they are so reasonable.
(Some lines *antè* we have the stage-direction: *A noise without.*)

13. S. Rowley, When you see me, you know me (ed. Elze, 11): —

Dost thou hear, Harry, what a coil they keep?

14. Eastward Ho! IV, 1 (The Works of George Chapman: Plays. Ed. R. H. Shepherd, 470a): —

'S light! I think the devil be abroad, in likeness of a storm, to rob me of my horns! Hark, how he roars! Lord! what a coil the Thames keeps!

15. Arden of Feversham, V, 6 (ed. Delius, 49): —

'Zounds! here's a coil;

You were best swear me on the interrogatories,

How many pistols you have took in hand,

Or whether I love the smell of gunpowder,

Or dare abide the noise the dag will make,

Or will not wink at flashing of the fire?

16. Rob. Chester's Loves Martyr ed. Grosart, 94 (for the New Shakspeare Society): —

Then Rage and Danger doth their senses haunt,

And like mad Ajax they a coile do keepe,

Till leane-fac'd Death into their heart doth creepe.

17. Histrio-Mastix, A. III, l. 92 (Simpson, The School of Shakspeare, II, 47): —

What a coyle keepes those fellows there?

18. A Pleasant Comedie of Pasquil and Katherine, A. II (Simpson, The School of Shakspeare, II, 162): —

What harsh, vnciuill tongue keeps such a coyle?

19. Marston, Antonio and Mellida, A. II init. (Keltie, The British Dramatists, Edinburgh, 1870, 352): —

'S lid (cried Signior Bulurdo) O for Don Basilisco's armour in the Mirror for Knighthood; what coil's here? O for an armour cannon-proof; O more cable, more featherbeds, more feather-

beds, more cable, till he had as much as my cable hatband, to fence him.

20. Hugh Holland, quoted in Malone's Shakespeare by Boswell (1821), II, 221 (according to S. Walker, Crit. Exam., II, 116): —

Here no need is of my sorry charmes
To boast it, though my braines Apollo warmes;
Where, like in Jove's, Minerva keeps a coile.

21. Nash, Summer's Last Will and Testament (Dodsley, 1825, IX, 26): —

Heigh ho! Here is a coil indeed to bring beggars to stocks.

22. Ibid. (Dodsley, 1825, IX, 40): —

Here is a coil about dogs without wit.

23. Nash, Pierce Pennilesse, ed. Collier, 48 (for the Shakespeare Society): —

Lord! what a coyle have we, this course and that course, removing this dish higher, setting another lower, and taking away the third. A generall might in lesse space remove his camp, than they stand disposing of their gluttony.

24. Nash, A Private Epistle of the Author to the Printer &c. before the second edition of Pierce Pennilesse (ed. Collier, XIV): —

And, lastly, to the ghost of Robert Greene, telling him what a coyle there is with pampheting [*sic*, read *pamphleting*] on him after his death.

25. Rob. Armin's Nest of Ninnies, ed. Collier, 28 (for the Shakespeare Society): —

Well, they fall out, they go together by the eares and such a hurly-burly is in the roome that passes. At last the stooles they fly about, the pots they walke, the glasses they go together; nay, the prayerbookes they flie into the fire, that such a noise there was that the whole house wondered at

this folly. Persuasions wer to no purpose; dores he would open none, till they violently brake them open, though they were of gold; and so they did and entered the parlour, found all this leuell [Collier conjectures *lewd* or *wicked*] coyle, and his pate broken, his face scratcht, and leg out of joynt.

26. Gascoigne's Princely Pleasures with the Masque intended to have been presented before Qu. Elizabeth at Kenilworth Castle 1575. With an Introductory Memoir and Notes. London, 1821. P. 6: —

What stir, what coil is here? come back, hold, whither now?

Not one so stout to stir, what harrying have we here?

27. Beaumont and Fletcher, The Humorous Lieutenant, V, 4: —

And such a coil there is

Such fending and such proving.

To these instances of the substantive 'coil' I join three passages in which the verb 'to coil' occurs, once in the signification 'to wind, to form ringlets', twice in the signification 'to beat, to drub'. They are: —

28. Beaumont and Fletcher, The Knight of Malta, II, 1: —

Third Sol. We have seen the fight, sir.

Nor. Yes; coil'd up in a cable, like salt eels,

Or buried low i' th' ballast: do you call that fighting?

29. A Comedy of K. Cambises (Hawkins, Origin of the English Drama, I, 266): —

Here draw and fight. Here she must lay on and coyle them both, the Vice must run his way for feare &c.

30. The Wife Lapped in Morel's Skin (The Old Taming of a Shrew, ed. Th. Amyot for the Shakespeare Society, 79): —

Except she turne and change her minde,

And eake her conditions euerichone,

She shall fynde me to her so vnkinde,

That I shall her coyle both backe and bone,
 And make her blew and also blacke,
 That she shall grone agayne for woe.

This is the whole number of instances of 'coil' which I have come across in Elizabethan literature; there may, no doubt, be many more, but I have no knowledge of them. I hardly need assure the reader that I do not withhold a single instance, least of all one where 'coil' might be taken in a different sense. As to the modern use of the word the influence of the Hamlet-passage, in many cases, is distinctly discernible, even where we have not to deal with a mere quotation of, or an intentional allusion to, it. I continue my list, beginning this, its second series with the era of the Restoration.

31. Davenant, *The Playhouse to be Let*, A. V (Works, 1673, II, 118): —

Widow, be friends, make no more such a hot coyle;
 We'll find out rich Husband to make the pot boyl.

32. Butler, *Hudibras*, Part I, Canto 3, 183 seqq.: —

He rag'd, and kept as heavy a Coil as
 Stout Hercules for Loss of Hylas;
 Forcing the Vallies to repeat
 The Accents of his sad Regret.

33. Scott, *The Lady of the Lake*, Canto III, 24: —

The signal roused to martial coil
 The sullen margin of Loch Voil.

34. *Ibid.*, Canto V, 16: —

Like adder darting from his coil,
 Like wolf that dashes through the toil,
 Like mountain-cat who guards her young,
 Full at Fitz-James's throat he sprung.

35. Scott, Rokeby, Canto III, 6: —

Thus circled in his coil, the snake
 When roving hunters beat the brake,
 Watches with red and glistening eye,
 Prepared, if heedless step draw nigh,
 With forked tongue and venom'd fang
 Instant to dart the deadly pang;
 But if the intruders turn aside,
 Away his coils unfolded glide
 And through the deep Savannah wind,
 Some undisturb'd retreat to find.

36. Scott, The Lord of the Isles, Canto I, Introd.: —

Where rest from mortal coil the mighty of the Isles.

37. Leigh Hunt, The Story of Rimini, init.: —

And when you listen you may hear a coil
 Of bubbling springs about the grassier soil.

38. R. Chambers, Traditions of Edinburgh (New Edition)

p. III: —

She now became alarmed, screamed for help, and waved her arms distractedly; all of which signs brought a crowd to the shore she had just left, who were unable, however, to render her any assistance, before she had landed on the other side — fairly cured, it appeared, of all desire of quitting the uneasy coil of mortal life.

Another passage in the same book has already been mentioned on p. 98.

39. Carlyle, History of Friedrich II of Prussia (Tauchn. Ed.) I, 192: —

The marriage was done in the Church of Innsbruck, 10 Feb. 1342 (for we love to be particular), Kaiser Ludwig, happy man, and many Princes of the Empire, looking on; little thinking what a coil it would prove.

The verb 'to coil' has only thrice occurred to me in modern writers, viz.:

40. Southey, *The Life of Nelson*, Chap. I (London, Bell, 1876, p. 21): —

He started up, and found one of the deadliest serpents of the country coiled up at his feet.

41. Galt, *The Life of Lord Byron* (Paris, Baudry, 1835) p. 232: —

I felt the many-foot and beetle creep,

And on my breast the cold worm coil and crawl.

42. J. G. Whittier, *Complete Poetical Works* (Boston, 1879) p. 1: —

The moonlight through the open bough

Of the gnarl'd beech, whose naked root

Coils like a serpent at his foot,

Falls, checkered on the Indian's brow.

After all these instances there can hardly remain a doubt as to the signification of the substantive 'coil' and it is evident that during the Elizabethan period it occurs exclusively in the meaning of 'turmoil, bustle, tumult, noise'; its second meaning (= ringlet, winding) being only to be met with in modern authors. The fact is, that we have to distinguish between two different words of entirely different origin. Messrs Wedgwood and Skeat are agreed in deriving 'coil' No. 1 from the Celtic; 'Gael. *goil*, boiling, fume, battle, rage, fury; O. Gael. *goill*, war, fight; Irish *goill*, war, fight; Irish and Gael. *goileam*, prattle, vain tattle; Gael. *coileid*, a stir, movement, noise. — Gael. and Ir. *goil*, to boil, rage.' As to 'coil' No. 2 there is as yet no proof that during the Elizabethan era it was used as a substantive; with the writers of this period it only occurs as a verb (see No. 28) which according to Mr Skeat originally means 'to gather together';

Mr Skeat and Mr Stratmann (Old English Dictionary, 3^d Ed., 128a) rightly derive it from O. F. *coillir*, *cuillir*, *cueillir*, Lat. *colligere*. Thus it appears that the substantive 'coil' in the sense of 'ringlet, winding' is a recent formation, derived from the verb. Even 'coil' No. 1 does by no means seem to be an old English word; it is not contained in either Stratmann's Dictionary or in Mätzner's Sprachproben (Glossary). Now, if critics are justly required to be conservative, commentators, in my opinion, ought to be possessed of the same quality, and ought by no means to ascribe any other signification to a word than that in which it is used, without exception, by contemporary writers. In the above line of Hamlet, therefore, a methodical critic has no choice left but to take 'mortal coil' simply, and unequivocally, in the sense of 'mortal turmoil, bustle, noise', which we are required or expected some day to shuffle off.

Under these circumstances I cannot refrain from thinking our passage to be corrupt. M. Mason, who was of the same opinion, proposed to read *this mortal spoil*; but neither Shakespeare, nor any other Elizabethan dramatist, seems to have used 'spoil' in the sense of 'slough', in which sense Mason wishes it to be understood. An anonymous critic in the Appendix to Shakespeare's Dramatic Works (Leipsic, 1826) p. 106 conjectures *foil* or *clay*, whilst I myself, in my edition of Hamlet (Leipzig, 1857), have been led to suggest 'vail' instead of 'coil'. I have, however, withdrawn this suggestion since I am convinced that the passage may be corrected in a much easier, and, at the same time, more satisfactory manner. Steevens, ad loc., quotes a similar passage from 'A dolfull discours of two Straungers, a Lady and a Knight' (in The firste Parte of Churchyardes Chippes, London, 1575, fol. 32 v.), without, however, profiting of the opportunity for correcting

the Hamlet-passage, which to him seems to have presented no difficulty whatever. Churchyard's verses are these: —

Yea, shaking of this sinfull soyle
 Me thincke in cloudes I see
 Amonge the perfite chosen lambs,
 A place preparte for mee.

It is certainly not assuming too much that Shakespeare had read Churchyard's *Chippes*, which were published when he was eleven years of age, and that the lines may have flashed through his memory when he was writing his most celebrated monologue. At all events our passage does not offer the least difficulty if we substitute 'soil' for 'coil'. The expression 'mortal soil' would on the contrary perfectly agree not only with the poet's own sentiments, but also with those of his contemporaries who love to represent the human body as a piece of earth or a heap of dirt or loam. Who does not remember Hamlet's words in the churchyard-scene (V, 1, 231): 'Alexander died, Alexander was buried, Alexander returneth to dust; the dust is earth; of earth we make loam, and why of that loam, whereto he was converted, might they not stop a beer-barrel?' — Similar passages occur in *The Tempest*, I, 2, 313: —

Caliban,

Thou earth, thou! speak —
 and *ibid.* I, 2, 345: —

I have used thee
 Filth as thou art with human care.

Still more to the point is the well-known line in Sonnet CXLVI, which forms, as it were, a transition from the Dolefull Discourse to our passage in Hamlet: —

Poor soul, the centre of my sinful earth.

Compare also K. John, V, 1, 57 seq.: —

And then, all this thou seest is but a clod
And module of confounded royalty.

Julius Cæsar, III, 1, 254: —

O pardon me, thou bleeding piece of earth.

The Merchant of Venice, V, 1, 63 seqq.: —

Such harmony is in immortal souls;
But whilst this muddy vesture of decay
Doth grossly close it in, we cannot hear it.

Among Shakespeare's contemporaries only the following may be quoted: Dekker, *Old Fortunatus* (*Old English Plays*, London, 1814, III, 112): —

I set an idiot's cap on virtue's head,
Turn learning out of doors, clothe wit in rags,
And paint ten thousand images of loam
In gaudy silken colours.

Th. Heywood's *Love's Mistress* I, 5 (*The Old English Drama*, London, 1825, II, 18): —

A piece of moving earth —

S. Rowley, *When you see me, you know me*, ed. Elze, 13: —

The child is fair, the mother earth and clay.

The *New Tragical Comedy of Apius and Virginia* (Dodsley, 1825, XII, 431 seq.) where Virginius exclaims: —

O man, O mould, o mucke, oh clay, oh hell, oh hellish
O false judge Appius, &c. [hounde,

Whetstone's *Remembraunce of the wel imployed Life, and godly End, of George Gascoigne, Esquire* (G. Gascoigne, ed. Arber, 24): —

And what is man? Dust, slime, a puf of winde,
Conceiued in sin, &c.

Glaphthorne, *Albertus Wallenstein*, III, 3 (*The Old English Drama*, II, 40): —

They (viz. these desires) are all fleshly

Sordid, as is the clay this frame's compos'd of.

Sir Philip Sidney, *An Apologie for Poetrie*, ed. Arber, 29: —
The final end is, to lead and draw vs to as high a perfection,
as our degenerate soules, made worse by theyr clayey lodgings,
can be capable of.

To these English writers a German contemporary of Shakespeare may be joined, who passed a great part of his life in London, viz. the poet Rudolf Weckherlin. His poem 'Elend des menschlichen Lebens' (W. Müller's *Bibliothek deutscher Dichter des siebzehnten Jahrhunderts*, IV, 81) begins with the following lines: —

Du wenig Koth, du wenig Staub,
Hochmüthig durch ein wenig Leben,
Durch welches Leben, wie ein Laub,
Du kannst ein' Weil' allhie umschweben.

All these instances are of too striking a character not to lend the strongest support to the emendation 'mortal soil'. But also in respect to the *ductus literarum* the alteration is most easy, for Quartos as well as Folios write both 'foyle' and 'foile', 'coyle' and 'coile' indifferently, and an f, negligently written, or damaged in printing, could be easily taken for a c. At all events, thus much seems certain that if the old editions had read 'mortal soil', nobody would have taken the least exception to this reading, and the most presumptuous of emendators would never have so much as dreamt of proposing 'mortal coil' for 'mortal soil'. (Shakespeare-Jahrbuch II, 362.)

XCIII.

Ham. So long? Nay then, let the devil wear black, for I'll have a suit of sables.

HAMLET, III, 2, 136 SEQ.

In the Shakespeare-Jahrbuch XI, 294 seq., I have tried to show that the contrast between a suit of sables and a mourning garment does not so much lie in the color as in the costliness and splendor of the material. In accordance with the immemorial Biblical usage of mourning in sackcloth and ashes, mourning garments to this day are made of coarse and dull-coloured material, whereas for a suit of sables the most gorgeous and brilliant stuff was selected. Since I wrote that note I have, however, come across some passages in our Middle High-German poets, from which it would appear, that usually garments of brightest colour, especially scarlet and green, were trimmed with sable, so that the contrast between a suit of sables and a black mourning garment would be complete even as to colour. I subjoin these passages in their original wording.

1. Seyfried Helbling, XIII, 179 (Haupt, Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum, Leipzig, 1844, Vol. IV, p. 214): —

Wirt mir niht *scharlach* unde *zobel*
ez wirt mir eins gebûren hobel
von eim guoten Pölingære.

2. Maier Helmbrecht 1343 — 1352 (Haupt, Zeitschrift für deutsches Alterthum, Vol. IV, p. 366): —

Der dritte sac der ist vol,
ûf und ûf geschoppet wol,
fritschâl brûnât, vêhe veder
dar under zwô, der ietweder
mit *scharlât* ist bedecket,
und dâ für gestrecket
einez, heizet *swarzer zobel*:
die hân ich in einem tobel
hie nâhen bî verborgen;
die gibe ich ir morgen.

3. Parcival, herausgegeben von Lachmann, 63, 24: —

Grüne samit was der mandel sîn:

ein *zobel* dâ vor gap *swarzen* schîn.

It seems that our ancestors — as far as they belonged to the Upper Ten Thousand — delighted in these brilliant garments, particularly in the contrast between bright-coloured materials and dark sable-trimmings.

XCIV.

For use almost can change the stamp of nature,

And either the devil, or throw him out

With wondrous potency.

HAMLET, III, 4, 168 SEQQ.

This is the reading of the quarto of 1604. The later quartos read: —

And master the devil, or throw him out,

whilst in the first quarto, as well as in the folios, the passage is wanting. Whether we follow QB, or its successors, the second line is incomplete and the editors therefore have properly endeavoured to fill it up. Believing the copyist or compositor of the second quarto to have been deceived by the similarity of the sound of two successive words I formerly suggested: —

And either *usher* the devil, or throw him out.

(The Athenæum, Aug. 11, 1866, 186.) Although Messrs Clark and Wright, in their annotated edition of the play, are likewise of opinion ‘that something is omitted which is contrasted with *throw out*’, yet I have now come to the conviction that most likely such an antithesis was not in the poet’s mind, but that his thoughts turned exclusively on the fact that by constant habit the vicious stamp of nature may be reformed. The

reading most likely to have come from the poet's pen seems therefore to be: —

And *either master* the devil or throw him out.

It is true, there is some slight tautology in it, but a tautology which is by no means foreign to Shakespeare. The compositor of the second quarto, I imagine, overlooked the second, those of the later quartos overlooked the first word of the two. As to the metre, I cannot agree with those critics who think it necessary that a monosyllable should be added after *either*, e. g. *curb* or *wean*. S. Walker (Versification, 75) is quite right in scanning: —

And either master th' devil [pronounce de'il], &c.

XCV.

They aim at it,

And botch the words up fit to their own thoughts.

HAMLET, IV, 5, 9 SEQ.

'The quartos', to use the words of Messrs Clark and Wright in their annotated edition, 'have *yawne*, doubtless a misprint from *ayme*, as the word is spelt in the first and second folios. *Aim* means here *to guess*, as in *Romeo and Juliet*, I, 1, 121: —

I aim'd so near when I supposed you loved.'

It may be questioned, however, whether we have the right word. May not *yawne* in the quartos be a misprint from *gape* just as well as from *ayme*? Compare K. John, II, 1, 375 seq.: —

As in a theatre, whence they gape and point

At your industrious scenes and acts of death.

(The Athenæum, Aug. 11, 1866, 186.)

XCVI.

The rabble call him lord;
 And, as the world were now but to begin,
 Antiquity forgot, custom not known,
 The ratifiers and props of every word,
 They cry, 'Choose we; Laertes shall be king!'

HAMLET, IV, 5, 102 SEQQ.

As no appropriate sense can be made out of 'the ratifiers and props of every word', though this is the uniform reading of the old editions, Warburton conjectured *of every ward*, Johnson, *of every weal*, and Tyrwhitt, *of every work*. None of these conjectures, however, is a real improvement on the text. I have no doubt that we should read *of every worth*, which would at once remove all difficulty. As far as worth is concerned, Laertes would be a proper person indeed to be elected king. But the king is not to be chosen, as in primeval times, for his worthiness alone; antiquity and custom come in for their share also; they are 'the ratifiers and props of every worth'. — Compare Thomson's Seasons, III, 943 seq.: —

At home the friend

Of every worth and every splendid art,
 and IV, 468: —

Thee, Forbes, too, whom every worth attends.

(Shakespeare's Hamlet, herausgegeben von Elze, Leipzig, 1857, 230. — The Athenæum, Aug. 11, 1866, 186. — Shakespeare's dramatische Werke nach der Uebersetzung von Schlegel und Tieck, herausgegeben von der Deutschen Shakespeare-Gesellschaft, VI, 177.)

XCVII.

Who, dipping all his faults in their affection,
 Would, like the spring that turneth wood to stone,
 Convert his gyves to graces.

HAMLET, IV, 7, 19 SEQQ.

The corruption of this passage does not lie in *gyves*, as Theobald and others have imagined, but in *graces*. How can *gyves*, a very material object, be converted into abstract *graces*? Not even the Knaresborough spring can effect such an illogical conversion. The context, in a word, will not bear an abstract noun in this place, which would entirely spoil the metaphor. Logical symmetry indeed might be restored, if *gyves* were replaced by an abstract noun, but the comparison then would be deprived of all force, of all sensible, not to say palpable, distinctness and Shakespeare would certainly never have introduced the Knaresborough spring in order to compare two abstract qualities. *Gibes* which has been proposed instead of *gyves* is fairly insufferable. I feel convinced that we ought to correct *graces* to *graves* (according to modern orthography *greaves*), which, at the same time, would give the verse a regular flow. According to the Folio, *graves* occurs in another passage of the poet, that, in some respect, bears a surprising similarity to ours, viz. 2 Henry IV, IV, 1, 50: —

Turning your books to graves, your ink to blood.*

In both passages something feeble or despicable is to be turned into *graves*, which not only form part of chivalric

* In this line *graves* has an obelus in the Globe Edition. Warburton conjectured *glaiues* which has been highly commended by Dr Ingleby in the Shakespeare-Jahrbuch, II, 220, whereas in his Shakespeare Hermeneutics, 61, he feels much less certain. *Glaiues* is not a Shakespearean word and *graves*, in my opinion, is the true reading.

armour, but, at the same time, are emblems of knighthood. Who does not recollect Homer's *ἐὐκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοί* and Chapman's *fair greaves* (Iliad XVIII, 415)? *Gyves*, in our passage, stands of course metonymically for those crimes and misdemeanours which ought to be punished by them, *graves* metonymically for those merits and signal deeds, which ought to be rewarded and distinguished by them, or, in a word, which ought to be knighted. The simile of the spring becomes most appropriate if we remember that gyves were originally made of wood. It is true, that in order to render it perfect, graves should have been made of stone instead of steel; but so far it may be conceded that *omne simile claudicat*. *Graces* is, to all appearance, a sophistication of the compositor who hesitated at the unusual word *graves*, provided it be not a simple mistake, which is still likelier. As to the orthography, *graves* instead of *greaves* is quite analogous to *thraves* (for *threaves*) and *stale* (for *steale* or *stele*); compare Mr Hooper's note on Chapman's Iliad XI, 477; Chapman's Iliad IV, 173 and Nares s. *Stele*. On the other hand, *hames* in South Warwickshire becomes *eames* according to Mr Halliwell-Phillipps, Dict. Arch. and Prov. Words, and Mrs Francis, South Warwickshire Provincialisms (in Original Glossaries &c. ed. by Walter W. Skeat for the English Dialect Society). (The Athenæum, Feb. 20, 1869, 284. — Shakespeare-Jahrbuch, XI, 295 seq.)

XCVIII.

Where be his quiddities now, his quillets, his cases, his tenures, and his tricks?

HAMLET, V, 1, 107 SEQQ.

Tenures undoubtedly stands in the wrong place; it is by no means synonymous with quiddities, cases and tricks, but belongs to the law-terms relative to the acquisition and transfer of property, and should accordingly be inserted four lines *infra*, between *recognisances* and *fines*. This suspicion is strongly confirmed by the Quarto of 1603, in however crude a state the passage may be given there. That this edition reads *tenements* instead of *tenures* is of no importance, inasmuch as our concern lies only with the position of the word, and in this respect it shows the right text. The passage there runs thus: 'Where is your quirks and quillets now, your vouchers and double vouchers, your leases and freehold, and tenements?' (The Athenæum, Feb. 20, 1869, 284.)

XCIX.

Woul't drink up esile? eat a crocodile?

HAMLET, V, 1, 299.

It is a matter of surprise to me that after all that has been written on this line there should still be found so many defenders of the old reading (QB *Esill*, FA *Esile* — not to speak of *vessels* in QA). Several critics have justly observed that it would not only be 'tame and spiritless', but 'inconsistent and even ridiculous' (Nares s. v.) to make Hamlet dare Laertes to drink 'large draughts of vinegar' in a scene whose every line is teeming with emphasis and hyperbole — nay, even bombast; and it was reserved for Al. Schmidt (Shakespeare-Lexicon s. *Eysell*) to think such ludicrous rant was to the purpose. 'Hamlet's questions', says Al. Schmidt, 'are apparently ludicrous, and drinking vinegar, in order to exhibit deep grief by a wry face, seems much more to the

purpose than drinking up rivers.' This is even less acceptable than the explanation given by Theobald, that Hamlet means to say, 'Wilt thou resolve to do things the most shocking and distasteful? and behold, I am resolute.' The other passages in which 'eysell' is mentioned do not bear in the least on the line under discussion; 'eysell' being there only spoken of as a medicine (thus e. g. in Sonnet CXI) or as 'an ingredient of the bitter potion given to our Saviour on the Cross' (Hunter, Illustrations, II, 263); nowhere is drinking eysell mentioned as a feat of courage and strength — as it would seem to be in the present passage. Mr Moberly assures his readers that 'a large draught of vinegar would be very dangerous to life' — he might have added that roast crocodile would not be a very wholesome dish either. This is certainly so far-fetched and tame a thought, that Shakespeare cannot have been guilty of it; it reminds the reader involuntarily of Capell's humorous remark that 'if Eisel be the right reading, it must be because 't is wanted for sauce to the crocodile.'

There are critics who would willingly give up the vinegar and side with those who are convinced that 'esile' is meant for a river, if it were not that in their opinion a Danish river must be referred to, or at least one that is not too far removed from Denmark; in default of a Danish river they are ready to put up with the Polish Weisel* or the Dutch Yssel, but they strongly object to the Nile as being at variance with the scenery of the play. This ill-founded objection has been refuted by Dr Furness who justly observes that Shakespeare 'who did not hesitate to make Hamlet swear by St. Patrick, would have been just as likely to mention a

* Does this form of the name occur elsewhere or has it been coined for the nonce? I greatly suspect the latter.

river in farthest Ind as in Denmark, if the name flashed into his mind, and would have been intelligible to his audience.' It may be added that the Nile is (and was) no less known in Denmark than in any other European country; I cannot conceive why the mention of so world-renowned a river should be inappropriate in the mouth of a Danish prince; but if so, the dramatic unity is just as much violated by the crocodile; in order to be consistent these critics should substitute some Danish — or at least some Baltic — beast for the crocodile. It may be safely asserted that Shakespeare never cared for Danish, Polish, or Dutch rivers, and that the name of a Danish river in this passage would indeed be the last that could have come from his pen.

It was certainly not only allowable to Shakespeare to introduce the Nile without violating the locality of his play, but it can be easily shown that he had the strongest motives for so doing. The grief of Laertes at the untimely and tragical death of his sister is uttered with such an emphasis that Hamlet cannot refrain from objecting to such obstreperous woe and from overawing him who utters it; he entirely gives the rein to hyperbole and bombast; he challenges Laertes to do whatever feat he may to express his sorrow and to be assured that he, Hamlet, will do the same, nay, more. Nothing can be more intelligible, more explicit: —

And, if thou prate of mountains, let them throw
Millions of acres on us; till our ground,
Singeing his pate against the burning zone,
Make Ossa like a wart! Nay, an thou'lt mouth,
I'll rant as well as thou.

One of the feats thus enumerated is drinking up the Nile, a feat than which nothing can better befit the occasion, as the Nile was considered in the days of Elizabeth not only

as the home of wonders and monsters, but also as the mightiest, nay, even as a measureless stream; our poet himself in *Titus Andronicus*, III, 1, 71, says: —

And now, like Nilus, it disdaineth bounds.

Besides, drinking up a river, or even the ocean, is an hyperbole very familiar to Elizabethan poets. Various passages have been quoted in support of these facts, both by English editors, and myself in my edition of this play; and I am now able to increase their number. The vast extension of the Nile is extolled by Marlowe in the first Part of *Tamburlaine*, V, 2 (ed. Dyce, 36b): —

Which had ere this been bath'd in streams of blood,

As vast and deep as Euphrates or Nile.

In the same play, Part 1, II, 3 (ed. Dyce, 15a) the poet makes *Tamburlaine* say: —

The host of Xerxes, which by fame is said

T' have drunk the mighty Parthian Araris,

Was but a handful to that we will have.

In the second part of *Tamburlaine*, III, 1 (ed. Dyce, 54a) *Orcanes* even mentions Nilus itself: —

I have a hundred thousand men in arms:

Some, that in conquest of the perjur'd Christian,

Being a handful to a mighty host,

Think them in number yet sufficient

To drink the river Nile or Euphrates,

And for their power enow to win the world.

Can it be doubted that Shakespeare was acquainted with these passages? He who is known to have inserted in the second part of his *K. Henry IV* (II, 4) the famous lines from the second part of *Tamburlaine* (IV, 3): —

Holla, you pampered jades of Asia,

What, can you draw but twenty miles a-day?

In Dawbridgescourt Belchier's Invisible Comedy of Hans Beer Pot (London, 1618, E, 3c) we meet with these lines: —

Enough my ladde, wilt drink an Ocean?

Methinks a whirlpool cannot ore drinke me.

Edward III, III, 1 (ed. Delius, '39): —

By land, with Xerxes we compare of strength,

Whose soldiers drank up rivers in their thirst.

Lochrine, IV, 4 (Malone's Supplement, II, 246; Hazlitt, Supplementary Works, 93; Doubtful Plays, Tauchn. Ed., 179): —

O what Danubius now may quench my thirst?

What Euphrates, what light-foot Euripus

May now allay the fury of that heat,

Which raging in my entrails eats me up?

Chapman's Revenge for Honour, III, 2 (The Works of George Chapman: Plays, edited, with Notes, by Richard Herne Shepherd, London, 1874, 433b): —

Sol. Let go round:

I'd drink 't, were it an ocean of warm blood

Flowing from th' enemy.

Delius, ad loc., gives it as his opinion that all difficulties would be removed, if the reading of the old editions was: —

Woo't drink up Nilus? eat a crocodile?

but he finds it difficult to believe that so familiar a word as *Nilus* could have been sophisticated into *vessels*, *Esill*, and *Esile*. To me this seems to be a *cura posterior*; provided we have got the right word, the word which is imperatively required by the context, we need not trouble ourselves with the inquiry as to how the corruption may have crept into the text. It is certainly very gratifying and adds to the force of an emendation if we are able to show the origin of the corrupted reading, but there are many passages in Shakespeare and his contemporaries where such an endeavour is,

and ever will be, vain, whereas the emendation itself cannot be doubted. Let any one try to explain the printers' mistakes that are committed even at this day! Many of them may certainly be accounted for by a foul case and in other ways, but no less a number will still baffle all explanation. Or has a critic ever yet been able to explain how the famous *Vllorana* found its way into the text? Yet who will defend it?

There remain two points still to be mentioned. First the words *drink up*. Notwithstanding what has been said to the contrary by Dr Furness and others, I still believe that this phrase means something more than simply 'to drink'; the preposition *up*, in my opinion, 'conveys the sense of totality or completeness' to use Mr Grant White's words; *up*, says Al. Schmidt, s. v., 'imparts to verbs the sense of completion, by indicating that the action expressed by them is fully accomplished.' I feel convinced that 'to drink up', to say the least of it, is applied much more fitly to a river than to vinegar. The parallel passages cited above are eloquent on this head too; I only refer to the lines in Edward III: —

Whose soldiers drank up rivers in their thirst;
and in *The Jew of Malta*, V, 4 (ed. Dyce, 178b): —

As sooner shall they drink the ocean dry.
'To drink up Nilus' is, in my opinion, equivalent to 'to drink Nilus dry.'

My second, — and last, — remark is on the crocodile. If drinking up Nilus (that 'disdaineth bounds') be conceded to be an hyperbole of the first water as it expresses a pure impossibility, it may be objected, that eating a crocodile would be a rather weak anticlimax and could not be placed on a level with the first-named feat of strength. I cannot admit such an objection to be just. Eating a crocodile is no less an impossibility on account of its impenetrable scales

which our poet's contemporaries imagined to be not only spear-proof, but even cannon-proof.* In *Lochrine*, A. III, init. Ate says: —

High on a bank, by Nilus' boisterous streams,
 Fearfully sat the Egyptian crocodile,
 Dreadfully grinding in her sharp long teeth
 The broken bowels of a silly fish:
 His back was arm'd against the dint of spear,
 With shields of brass that shone like burnish'd gold.

Another passage brings us still nearer to Shakespeare, viz. 1 *Tamburlaine*, IV, 1 (ed. Dyce, 25a): —

While you, faint-hearted, base Egyptians,
 Lie slumb'ring on the flow'ry banks of Nile,
 As crocodiles that unaffrighted rest,
 While thund'ring cannons rattle on their skins.

Now let *Lacertes* try his teeth on such a skin!

In short, my conviction, that Shakespeare wrote: —

Woul't drink up *Nilus*? eat a crocodile?
 is more confirmed than ever it was before.

C.

That handkerchief

Did an Egyptian to my mother give;

* The source of these hyperbolic descriptions may be found in the forty first chapter of *Job*, where we read: 'The sword of him that layeth at him [viz. *leviathan*] cannot hold: the spear, the dart, nor the habergeon. He esteemeth iron as straw, and brass as rotten wood. The arrow cannot make him flee: slingstones are turned with him into stubble. Darts are counted as stubble: he laugheth at the shaking of a spear.' — Compare also *Job* XL, 23: 'Behold, he [viz. *behemoth*] drinketh up a river, and hasteth not; he trusteth that he can draw up *Jordan* into his mouth,'

She was a charmer, and could almost read
 The thoughts of people: — —
 'T is true: there's magic in the web of it:
 A sibyl, that had number'd in the world
 The sun to course two hundred compasses,
 In her prophetic fury sew'd the work;
 The worms were hallow'd that did breed the silk;
 And it was dyed in mummy which the skilful
 Conserved of maidens' hearts.

OTHELLO, III, 4, 55 SEQQ.

A parallel passage which as far as I know has never been referred to occurs in Ben Jonson's *Sad Shepherd*, II, 1: —

But, hear ye, Douce, because ye may meet me
 In many shapes to-day, where'er you spy
 This browder'd belt with characters, 't is I.
 A Gypsan lady, and a right beldame,
 Wrought it by moonshine for me, and star-light,
 Upon your grannam's grave, that very night
 We earth'd her in the shades; when our dame Hecate
 Made it her gaing night over the kirk-yard,
 With all the barkand parish-tikes set at her,
 While I sat whyrland of my brazen spindle:
 At every twisted thrid my rock let fly
 Unto the sewster, who did sit me nigh,
 Under the town turnpike; which ran each spell
 She stitched in the work, and knit it well.

See ye take tent to this, and ken your mother.

Can it be doubted that this is an imitation, by which Jonson intended, more or less, to ridicule Shakespeare? Gifford, of course, would never have acknowledged it. (*Shakespeare-Jahrbuch*, XI, 299 seq.)

ADDENDA.

XX.

There is, perhaps, a third way of scanning the line: —

Mountney and Valingford, as I heard them named,
namely, by contracting 'Mountney and' and beginning the
verse with two trochees: —

Moúntn' and | Váling | ford, ás | I heárd them nám'd.
Lines beginning with two trochees are by no means unusual;
compare, e. g., Marlowe, 1 Tamburlaine, I, 2 (Works, ed.
Dyce, 9a): —

Duke of Africa and Albania.

Marlowe, The Massacre at Paris (Works, ed. Dyce, 245 b): —

Tell me, surgeon, and flatter not — may I live?

Arden of Feversham, III, 5 (ed. Delius, 45): —

How now, Alice? What, sad and passionate?

Ibid. III, 5 (ed. Delius, 49): —

Go in, Bradshaw, call for a cup of beer.

Milton, Samson Agonistes, 443: —

By th' idolatrous rout amidst their wine.

As to the contraction 'Mountney and' it is much more allowable than some readers would readily believe. Such 'swallowing or eating vp one letter by another when two vowels meete, whereof th' ones sound goeth into other' is reckoned among the 'auricular figures' by Puttenham, The Arte of English Poesie, ed. Arber, 174. He gives two instances, viz. *l' attaine* for *to attaine*, and *sor' and smart* for

sorrow and smart. Puttenham closely connects this figure with what he calls the 'figures of rabbate' (p. 173), of which he discerns three different kinds, viz. 'from the beginning, as to say *twixt* for *betwixt*, *gainsay* for *againesay*, *ill* for *euill*; from the middle, as to say *paraunter* for *paraenture*, *poorety* for *pouertie*, *souraigne* for *soueraigne*, *tane* for *taken*; from the end, as to say *morne* for *morning*, *bet* for *better*, and such like.' All this 'swallowing' and 'rabbating', however harsh it may sound in modern ears, is authorised as customary and legitimate by Puttenham; in fact, similar contractions most frequently occur in the works of Elizabethan dramatists and even in Milton; thus, e. g., *Fair Em*, ed. Delius, 8 (Simpson, II, 416): —

Mariá | na, I háve | this day | receív | ed lét | ters.

Ibid. Delius, 35 (Simpson, II, 447): —

Yea and Wíl | liam's toó, | if hé | dený | her mé,

and: —

My sór | rows afflict | my soúl | with é | qual pás | sion.

Milton, *Samson Agonistes*, 362: —

Ordain'd | thy núr | ture hó | ly, as óf | a plánt.

Ibid. 378: —

The mýs | terý | of Gód | given me ún | der plédge,
although a different scansion of this last line may be admissible, viz.: —

The mýs | t'ry óf | God gív'n | me ún | der plédge.

With respect to the line: —

But, Valingford, search the depth of this device,
we may, perhaps, remove the difficulty by expunging *But*, so that there would be no occasion for supposing 'Valingford' to have been sometimes pronounced as a dissyllable.

It is, of course, no very difficult task to find in 'Fair Em' many other passages which have been corrupted from

metre to prose. Let me notice only a few. First, the following lines in A. III, Sc. 1 (Delius, 26; Simpson, II, 436 seq.): —

Marq. Hard hap, to break us off our talk, so soon!
Sweet Mariana, do remember me! [*Exit.*]

Mar. Mariana* cannot choose but remember thee.

Enter BLANCH.

Blanch. Mariana,
Well met. You 're very forward in your love.

Mar. Madam,
Be it in secret spoken to yourself:
If you'll but follow th' complot I 've invented, &c.
The lines that follow I do not know how to set right and
therefore resume, some eight or nine lines lower down: —
The next time that Sir Robert shall come here**
In's wonted sort to solicit me with love
I'll seem t' agree and like of anything
That th' knight shall demand, so far forth as it be
No impeachment to my chastity; t' conclude,
I will appoint*** some place for t' meet the man,
For my conveyance from the Denmark court.

Another passage of the same kind occurs soon after (Delius, 27; Simpson, II, 437), viz. the speech of William the Conqueror beginning: 'Lady, this is well and happily met.' Simpson most felicitously adds *for* before *Fortune* and justly remarks that *sinister* is to be pronounced as a dissyllable (*sin'ster*). Thus metre is restored throughout, except in the first line, and even here it may be easily recovered by the addition of *sweet* before *lady*. Compare Fair Em, ed. Delius, 19

* Both Delius and Simpson read 'Thy Mariana', in accordance, I have no doubt, with the old editions. ** For the word *here* I am answerable. *** Delius reads: 'and to conclude, appoint some place,' &c.; Simpson: 'And, to conclude, point some place,' &c.

(Simpson, II, 428): Sweet lady, for thy sake. Ibid., ed. Delius, 25 (Simpson, II, 435): Sweet lady, cease, &c. The passage, therefore, should be printed: —

Sweet lady, this is well and happily met;
 For Fortune hitherto hath been my foe,
 And though I 've often sought to speak with you,
 Yet still I have been cross'd with sinister haps.
 I cannot, madam, &c.

The most conspicuous instance, however, of verse turned to prose, is A. II, Sc. 2 (according to Delius, 19 seqq., or A. II, Sc. 6 according to Simpson, II, 428 seqq.). I transcribe the whole scene in metre, in which shape, in my conviction, it came from the author's pen: —

Mar. Trust me, my Lord, I'm sorry for your hurt.

Lub. Gramercy, madam; but it is not great,
 Only a thrust, prick'd with a rapier's point.

Mar. How grew the quarrel, my Lord?

Lub. Sweet,* for thy sake.
 There was last night** two maskers*** in our com-
 pany,****

Myself the foremost; the others strangers were
 'Mongst which,† when th' music 'gan†† to sound the
 measures,

Each masker made choice of his lady; and one,
 More forward than the rest, stept††† towards thee;

* Both Delius and Simpson: 'Sweet lady'; according to the latter, Chetwood proposed the omission of 'lady'. ** Simpson: 'this last night'. *** Delius: 'masques'; Simpson: 'masks'. According to Delius, XI, the correction 'maskers' is due to Chetwood. **** Delius and Simpson: 'in one company'; the correction was made by Simpson in a note. 'Company' is, of course, to be pronounced as a dissyllable. † Delius and Simpson: 'amongst the which'. †† Delius and Simpson: 'began'. ††† Delius: 'steps'.

Which I perceiving
 Thrust him aside and took thee out* myself.
 But this was taken in so ill a** part
 That at my coming out of*** the court-gate,
 With justling together, it was my chance to be
 Thrust into th' arm. The doer thereof, because
 He was th' original cause of the disorder,
 At th'**** inconvenient time, was presently
 Committ'd, and is this morning sent for hither†
 To answer th' matter; and here, I think, †† he comes.

Enter WILLIAM THE CONQUEROR with a JAILOR.

What, Sir Robert of Windsor? How now!

Wm Cong. I' faith, ††† a prisoner; but what ails your

Lub. Hurt by mischance last night. †††† [arm?

Wm Cong. What? Not in the mask at the court-gate?

Lub. Yes, trust me, there.

Wm Cong. Why then, my Lord, I thank you for my

Lub. And I you for my hurt, if it were so. [lodging.⁰

Keeper, away!

I here⁰⁰ discharge you of your prisoner. [*Exit Keeper.*

Wm Cong. Lord Marquess!

You offer'd me disgrace to shoulder me.

Lub. Sir!

I knew you not, and therefore pardon me,⁰⁰⁰

* For 'out' I am responsible. ** 'A' was first added by Chetwood. *** Delius: 'out at'. *** Delius and Simpson: 'At that inconvenient.' † For 'hither' I am responsible. †† Delius and Simpson: 'I think here'. ††† Delius and Simpson: 'I' faith, my Lord'; the latter, however, remarks in a foot-note: 'Dele *my Lord*'. †††† Delius: 'Hurt last night, by mischance'; Simpson: 'Hurt the last night, by mischance.' ⁰ Delius and Simpson: 'my night's lodging.'
⁰⁰ 'Here' added by the present writer. ⁰⁰⁰ Delius and Simpson: 'you must pardon me.'

And th' rather* as** it might be alleged to me
 Of mere simplicity, to see another
 Dance with my mistress, disguis'd, myself*** in 'presence.
 But seeing it was our haps**** to damnify
 Each other unwillingly, let's be content
 With both† our harms and lay the fault where 't was,
 And so be †† friends.

Wm Cong. I' faith, I am content with my night's lodging,
 If you be ††† with your hurt.

Lub. Not †††† that I have 't,
 But I 'm⁰ content to forget how I came by 't.

Wm Cong. My Lord,
 Here comes the⁰⁰ lady Blanch, let us away.

Enter BLANCH.

Lub. With right good will.⁰⁰⁰ [*To Mariana*] Lady,
 [will you stay?

Mar. Madam — [*Exeunt William the Conqueror and*
Lubeck.

Blanch. Mariana, as I'm grievèd with thy presence,
 So am I not offended for thy absence,
 And, were it not a breach to modesty,
 Thou shouldest know before I left thee. [madness!

Mar. [*Aside*] How near this humour is akin⁰⁰⁰⁰ to

* Perhaps it may be thought preferable to expunge 'And' and to write: 'The rather'. ** 'As', inserted by the present writer. *** Delius and Simpson: 'and I myself.' **** Qy. read, 'hap'? † 'Both' added by the present writer. †† Delius and Simpson: 'become'. ††† Delius and Simpson: 'if you be content.' †††† Delius and Simpson, 'Not content.' ⁰ 'I'm' added by the present writer. ⁰⁰ 'The' added by the present writer. ⁰⁰⁰ Delius and Simpson: 'With good will.' Compare, Fair Em, ed. Delius, 30, l. 9; Simpson, II, 441, l. 7. ⁰⁰⁰⁰ Delius and Simpson: 'Is this humour to madness.' 'Akin' has been added by the present writer.

If you hold on to talk* as you begin,
You 're in a pretty way to scolding.

Blanch. To scolding, huswife?

Mar. Madam, here comes one.

Enter a MESSENGER with a Letter.

Blanch. There does indeed. Fellow, wouldst thou
Have anything with anybody here?

Mess. I have a letter to deliver to the Lady Mariana.**

Blanch. Give it me.

Mess. There must none but she have it.

[Blanch snatcheth the Letter from him.]

Blanch. Go to, foolish fellow. *[Exit Messenger.]*

And, therefore, to ease the anger I sustain,
I'll be so bold to open it. What's here?

'Sir Robert greets you well!'

You, mistress, his love, his life? Oh, amorous*** man,
How**** he his new mistress entertains,
And on his old friend Lubeck doth bestow†
A horned‡‡ nightcap to keep in his wit.

Mar. Madam,

Though you discourteously have‡‡‡ read my letter,
Yet, pray you,‡‡‡‡ give it me.

Blanch. Then thake it, there, and there, and there.

[She tears it. Exit Blanch.]

* For 'to talk' I am responsible. ** The Messenger speaks in prose. *** 'Amorous' to be pronounced as a dissyllable. **** 'How' is to be considered a monosyllabic foot. Or are we to read: 'How his new mist(e)ress he entertains'? Or: 'How he his *newest* mistress entertains'? Delius and Simpson: 'entertains his new mistress.' † Delius and Simpson: 'and bestows on Lubeck, his old friend.' ‡‡ Delius and Simpson: 'A horn nightcap.' ‡‡‡ Delius and Simpson: 'have discourteously.' ‡‡‡‡ Delius and Simpson: 'I pray you'.

Mar. How far doth this differ from modesty!
 Yet I will gather up the pieces, which,
 Haply, may show to me th' intent thereof,
 Though not the meaning.

[*She gathers up the pieces and joins them.*

[*Reads.*] 'Your servant and love, Sir Robert of Windsor, alias William the Conqueror, wisheth long health and happiness.'

Is this then* William the Conqueror
 Shrouded** under th' name of Sir Robert of Windsor?
 Were he the monarch of the world, he should
 Not dispossess my*** Lubeck of his love.
 Therefore I'll to the court, there,**** if I can,
 Close to be friends with Lady Blanch, thereby†
 To keep my love, my Lubeck,†† for myself,
 And further the Lady Blanch in her own††† suit,
 As much as e'er†††† I may.

XXIV. .

After the third line of the passage beginning: —

Infortunate Valingford, &c.

there is no doubt a gap which should be stopped by some such line as the following: —

yet ne'ertheless

I fairly hope, all will be well again;

I am acquainted &c.

* 'Then' added by the present writer. ** 'Shrouded' is to be pronounced as a monosyllable; compare Abbott, *Shakespearian Grammar*, 472. *** For 'my' the present writer is responsible. **** *Delius* and *Simpson*: 'and there.' † *Delius* and *Simpson*: 'and thereby.' †† *Delius* and *Simpson*: 'keep Lubeck, my love.' ††† 'Own' added by the present writer. †††† For 'e'er' I am responsible. . .

In the next passage the words *prosperity*, *expectation*, and *Sweet Em*, may be retained by the aid of contractions, and by the introduction of a short line: —

Sweet Em, I hither came to parle of love,
 Hoping t' have found thee in thy wont'd prosper'ty;
 And have the Gods
 Thwart'd so unmerc'fully my expectation,
 By dealing so sinisterly with thee,
 Sweet Em?

Em. Good sir, no more; &c.

These are certainly harsh verses and 'vile' contractions (to borrow this epithet from Polonius), but we must take them as we find them. Perhaps, however, these and all similar lines should not be scanned in the ordinary way; and it may be doubted whether they are not rather constructed after the model of Early English verse, where only the accented syllables are counted, whereas the number of the unaccented ones is more or less indefinite.

XXVI.

There is another, and perhaps preferable, way of arranging the lines in question, viz. thus: —

Wm Cong. Hence, villains, hence!

How dare you lay your hands upon your sovereign!*

Sol. Well, sir, we'll deal for that!

But here comes one will remedy all this.

* Or, according to Simpson: —

Dare you to lay your hands upon your sovereign!

XXX.

I cannot dismiss the Comedy of 'Fair Em' without adding a few more corrections. In the third scene (Delius, 8; Simpson, II, 416) we read as follows: —

King Den. Mariana, I have this day received letters
From Swethia, that lets me understand
Your ransom is collecting there with speed,
And shortly hither shall be sent to us.

Mar. Not that I find occasion to mislike
My entertainment in your Grace's court,
But that I long to see my native home.

Evidently there is something wanting here; Mariana's speech should begin with a line somewhat to the following effect: —

It glads my heart to hear these joyful tidings;

Not that I find occasion to mislike, &c.

Instead of 'to mislike', which is an emendation by Simpson, the quarto of 1631 reads 'of mislike'; Delius, 'to misliking'.

Farther on, (Delius, 36; Simpson, II, 448) we meet with this passage: —

Dem. Pardon, my dread lord, the error of my sense,
And misdemeanour to your princely excellency.

Wm Cong. Why, Demarch, what is the cause my subjects are in arms?

Dem. Free are my thoughts, my dread and gracious lord,

From treason to your state and common weal.

There are no differences in the readings, except that Delius puts a semicolon after 'Demarch' and a comma after 'cause'. The substitution of 'excellence' (pronounced as a dissyllable) for 'excellency' in the second line seems to be indispensable

to the restoration of the metre. The words 'Why, Demarch' form an interjectional line; and in the last line we should insert the definite article before 'common weal.' The whole passage, therefore, ought to be printed: —

Dem. Pardon, my dread lord, th' error of my sense,
And misdemeanour to your princely excellence.

Wm Cong. Why, Demarch,
What is the cause my subjects are in arms?

Dem. Free are my thoughts, my dread and gracious lord,
From treason to your state and th' common weal.

Another difficulty is raised by the line in A. V, Sc. 2 (Delius, 45; or A. III, Sc. 17 according to Simpson, II, 457): —

And think you I convey'd away your daughter Blanch?
which may be reduced to a blankverse in three different ways. The first expedient is to omit *And* and to contract *you I*: —

Think you I' | convey'd | away | your daugh | ter Blánc?
Compare Addenda No. XX and No. XXIV. Secondly, *away* might be expunged: —

And think you I convey'd your daughter Blanch?
In support of this alteration the following line from Fair Em (ed. Delius, 39; Simpson, II, 451) may be quoted: —

Saying, I conveyed her from the Danish court,
whilst, at the same time, it would correspond to the expression 'to steal' or 'to steal away' which is used repeatedly in this scene in respect to the elopement of Lady Blanch. The third way is the omission of *Blanch*: —

And think you I conveyed away your daughter?
Your daughter Blanch occurs five lines lower down, and also at the end of a verse; it seems, therefore, not unlikely that

these words have been inserted in the line under discussion through faulty anticipation.

The last passage on which I wish to make a remark occurs on page 46 of Delius's edition (Simpson, II, 459): —

Dem. May it please your highness:

Here is the lady you sent me for.

The metre evidently requires the addition of *whom*: —

Here is the lady *whom* you sent me for.

THE END.

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY



138 293

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY